

nounced 1959 Nixon visit, Gomulka telephoned Khrushchev and asked whether he should not cancel the visit in view of the restlessness shown by the people immediately after the announcement. Khrushchev counseled patience, but the enthusiastic reception shown to Nixon as well as to other American visitors still forces the Communist Government to prove its Marxist loyalty by making speeches against American imperialism. Simultaneously, of course, Gomulka begs Washington for shipments of farm surpluses.

To the outsider this Polish picture seems illogical and paradoxical. But somehow or

other the system works. One reason is that Poland, alone among the Soviet-bloc countries, has enough to eat. Another is that the Poles have learned to mix their communism with dollops of bourgeois democracy. The visible signs of this mixture could be seen at an open-air book fair stretching along Warsaw's tree-lined Ujazdowska Avenue. There were only a handful of Communist bookstands out of the 250 showing everything from jazz lexicons to Chinese scrolls and Yiddish newspapers.

Comrade Werfel of Wroclaw has an explanation. "Polish Communists," he says, "are patient people. We can wait."

But if he is waiting for the Poles to cease being Western, the prospects are for a much longer wait than even Comrade Werfel expects.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge the membership of the House of Representatives to give careful consideration to the materials which I have just placed in the RECORD—and to bear them in mind when we turn to consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 and the issue of our relations with the countries which are today living under Communist domination.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, who rulest all things in wisdom and righteousness, our wills are ours to make them Thine. Give us to understand the vanity of so many of the things we hold closest to our eyes in the present, often hiding from us the glory of the eternal.

In all the tangle of human relationships give us the fairness to be as hard and stern with ourselves as we are critical of other people. Save us from missing the highest goals by self-pity or self-indulgence.

In a day of confusion and evasion let our thinking be keen and clear, our speech frank and open, our actions courageous and decisive. May the glaring surface lights in the streets not blur for our eyes the shining principles above them that are steady as the stars.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 15, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7532) to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to funds received by the Post Office Department from payments for damage to personal property, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8824. An act to modify the application of the personal holding company tax in the case of consumer finance companies;

H.R. 9520. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 10095. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1963, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10928. An act to transfer casein or lactarene to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H.R. 11400. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H.R. 8824. An act to modify the application of the personal holding company tax in the case of consumer finance companies;

H.R. 9520. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 10095. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1963, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10928. An act to transfer casein or lactarene to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H.R. 11400. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the legislative calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—HOURS FOR SENATE MEETINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President. I remind the Senate at this time that there is a very heavy accumulation of business awaiting conference, on the calendar, or in committee. Much of this is business which, for the good of the Nation, ought not to be delayed. It requires decision one way or the other in order that there may be intelligent planning for the months ahead on the part of the Government and the public.

The leadership does not prejudice the decisions on any of this pending business. But it most certainly judges it to be necessary that the decisions be made in order to dispel some of the uncertainty which has been accumulating in recent months throughout the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership beginning on Wednesday, and most mornings thereafter, to call the Senate into session at about 10 a.m., and to run the daily meetings until 7 or 8 p.m. until the end of the session, as may be necessary. Similarly, as may be necessary, beginning this week, there shall be Saturday meetings until the end of the session. The Senate is also advised, in response to a number of inquiries of Members, that it may count on only 1 day's recess at the 4th of July, that is, the day of the 4th.

I know that some Members have campaign problems and a heavier work schedule will complicate them. I know, too, that there will be much personal inconvenience in longer hours. But the leadership at this point can see only one alternative to longer hours—the neglect of the Senate's business, to the detriment of the Nation. That course, the leadership cannot endorse. If there are other alternatives, any Member is at liberty to suggest them. As for myself, it seems to me most essential that we stay on the job and act on as much of the legislative program as is feasible. The President has a right to expect decisions now one way or the other. The people of the Nation have a right to expect decisions one way or the other.

Insofar as the Senate is concerned, the leadership believes we must adhere to these matters in committee and on the floor until the decisions are made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that there presently are prepared 33 amendments to the satellite bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had heard there were 40.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think by count there are 33, but there could be more. I apprehend, under those circumstances, that possibly the major portion of this week will be devoted to this bill. Is that the belief of the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the distinguished minority leader in that analysis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And what will follow the satellite bill, if the Senator knows now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, there are a number of measures which must be completed by June 30. There is the extension of corporate excise taxes, which has passed the House. There is the increase in the debt ceiling, which has passed the House. There is the Sugar Control Act to consider. On those three measures, I anticipate there will be rollcalls.

There is the extension of the Defense Production Act. There is the authority to renegotiate defense contracts. There is the Export Control Act, which is on the calendar and had been held up last week at the request of the two Senators from New York. There is the measure on changes in the public welfare program, which it is anticipated will be brought up shortly.

So far as the Export Control Act and the changes in the public welfare program are concerned, it is anticipated there will be rollcalls on those measures.

There is also on the calendar the military construction authorization bill, which, I am informed, must be considered before the appropriation bill having to do with defense matters is finally passed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the rest of this session.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I must object to that request. As a member of the committee, I should like to attend its meetings insofar as possible. I would not object if the request were for today, or if it were made on that basis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

A letter from the chairman and members of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated June 12, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THE PERRY'S VICTORY AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE MEMORIAL NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF SIXTH GUAM LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Sixth Guam Legislature, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

RESOLUTION 256

Resolution relative to respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the payment of rental claims of landowners in and to parcels of real property known as Route No. 10

Whereas immediately after the reoccupation of Guam by the Armed Forces of the United States, the U.S. Government occupied portions of real property within Guam, including a strip of land from the municipality of Barrigada up to the municipality of Chalan Pago, which has since been occupied by the U.S. Government and designated as Route No. 10; and

Whereas the landowners were compensated for the use of these parcels of land from 1947 up to and including June 30, 1951, but that since July 1, 1951, up to and including January 27, 1958, the landowners were not compensated for the use of their lands; and

Whereas the reason for such absence of compensation to these landowners was the lack of legal and proper representation of such landowners and their lack of knowledge thereof as to their rights and claims for the use of their properties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby respectfully request and memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for payment of rentals to landowners for the period from July 1, 1951, through January 27, 1958, for use of their properties located within Route No. 10, Guam; and be it further

Resolved That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption

hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House, to the Department of the Interior, and to the Governor of Guam.

Duly adopted on the 9th day of June, 1962.

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.

V. B. BAMBA,
Legislative Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 11879. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1604).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3203. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1605).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3431. A bill to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact and to the participation of certain additional States in such compact in accordance with the terms of such amendment; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3432. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension or operation of certain facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3433. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the centennial of the national cemetery at Fort Scott, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3434. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN (by request):

S. 3435. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to permit the private carriage of letters and packets in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3436. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHANGE IN THE PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMPACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators FONG, GRUENING, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, MAGNUSON, MORSE, NEUBERGER and JACKSON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for congressional approval of a change in the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact, which now exists between the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

The change consists of an addition to the existing compact of article XII which provides, in part:

The States of Alaska or Hawaii, or any State having rivers or streams tributary to the Pacific Ocean may become a contracting State by enactment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact.

Upon congressional ratification of the compact, Alaska, Hawaii, and Idaho will be eligible for membership.

California, Oregon, and Washington, the original members of the compact, have agreed to the new article XII, and on May 4 of this year, the Governor of Alaska signed a bill providing for Alaska's membership in the compact. To date, Hawaii and Idaho have taken no action to join but they will be admitted if they so desire. The ratification of the change in the compact, and the admission of Alaska to the compact now await congressional approval.

Mr. President, there exists a great community of interest among Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii, and Idaho—the States which are linked to each other by the waters which produce our rich Pacific fishery harvest. The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission is an outgrowth of this community of interest. As members of the commission, Washington, Oregon, and California have been cooperating since 1947 to sponsor research, to promote uniformity of regulation and to further the conservation and development of our Pacific fisheries. The time has now come to amend the original compact to make possible the admission of Alaska, Hawaii, and Idaho.

Mr. President, the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, created by the compact, was designed to cope with the problems of conserving and regulating, on a sustained yield basis, the fishery resources of our Pacific Coast States. The 1947 reports by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by the House Committee on Merchant Marine Fisheries on the original bill to create the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission summarized the reasons for the creation of the commission. These reasons are still valid and apply with equal force to the bill which I introduce today. The reports—House Report 752, Senate Report 513, 80th Congress, 1st session, 1947—stated:

Experience with the halibut, salmon, and other fisheries has demonstrated, however, that unless substantial measures are taken to control the utilization of the fishery to prevent its depletion, the future of any fishery can be completely destroyed. The joinder of the interests and activities of the three States concerned with the Pacific fisheries, through the Pacific Coast Marine

Fisheries Compact, is a substantial step in the direction of insuring joint and coordinated action, based on adequate action, against unwise utilization of the Pacific coast fisheries and to insure its future development and use.

The compact is similar to the Atlantic Coast Marine Fisheries Compact which was approved by Congress in 1942—56 Stat. 267—5 years before the creation of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact. As a result of the activities of the commissions created pursuant to both compacts, substantial cooperation has been achieved in the conservation and management of the fishery resources of both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

The activities of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission since its creation have included research, recommendations designed to provide uniformity of State laws for conserving our Pacific fisheries, and representation at various conferences concerned with fisheries. Through the efforts of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission a degree of uniformity in State fishing laws has been achieved and there has been progress in establishing plans, programs, and research for conservation.

The research activities of the commission have included work on such important resources as shrimp, salmon, albacore, crab, the otter trawl industry, and groundfish.

Members of the commission have attended conferences concerned with such subjects as waste disposal in the marine environment, tuna, the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, Japanese high seas salmon fisheries, the coordination of fishery regulations with Canada, and the proposal to widen the 3-mile belt of territorial jurisdiction. It has maintained liaison with the Atlantic as well as the Gulf States Fishery Commissions. Among the resolutions of the commission have been those recommending that Alaska, Hawaii, and Idaho be invited to membership in the commission, and that the member States undertake certain joint research projects. In addition, the commission has been a mechanism for the coordination of the fishery regulations among the member States and between the member States and Canada. Moreover, it has served as an informal point of contact where interstate problems have existed.

Mr. President, there are many problems associated with achieving coordinated development and conservation of our Pacific fishery resources. A great part of this resource is migratory. Salmon, for instance, move freely without regard to State or international boundaries. The salmon returns to its stream of origin to spawn after the long journey, hundreds of miles in the ocean. If the spawning area is disrupted or if too few salmon return up the stream to spawn, it may mean the extinction of the salmon run on that particular stream. Such activities as the protection of spawning grounds, and the provision for adequate escapement are therefore crucial if we are ever to conserve and harvest, on a sustained yield basis, this great natural resource.

However, if we are to prevent the depletion of our salmon fishery stocks, we must have wholehearted cooperation and coordination among our Pacific Coast States. The survival of this fishery also depends upon effective and enforced agreements between the United States and other nations—Canada, Japan, Russia—with fishery interests in the Pacific.

Already, Mr. President, we have witnessed the destruction and virtual depletion of a once productive resource, the pilchard fishery. This fishery, once the basis for a thriving industry in the 1930's, now has become practically extinct. Let us hope that it is not too late to devise adequate protective measures for such crucial fisheries as salmon.

Although Alaska is not yet a member of the Commission, it has, as a Territory and later as a State, cooperated informally with the work of the Commission, particularly in salmon research and conservation programs. For example, the Commission has had an employee stationed at Pelican, Alaska, during the troll salmon season to sample the incidence of marked fish in the landings. The admission of Alaska, now awaiting only congressional approval of this bill, will enable Alaska, in cooperation with Washington, Oregon, and California, more effectively to develop and conserve our great Pacific fishery resources for the Nation as a whole.

Since the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission performs such a crucial function in furthering the conservation and development of the fishery resources of the Pacific coast, and since congressional ratification of the change in the compact will make the work of the Commission more effective, it is my hope that both the Senate and House will give speedy approval to this bill in order that Alaska, Hawaii, and Idaho may play their proper part along with Washington, Oregon, and California in conserving the great, yet not inexhaustible fishery resources of our Pacific coast.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the table for 7 days, so that other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring it may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 3431) to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact and to the participation of certain additional States in such compact in accordance with the terms of such amendment, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to (1) the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact, initially approved by the Act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 419), between the

States of California, Oregon, and Washington, by the addition of a new article XII to such compact as set forth in section 2 of this Act, and (2) to the participation in such compact, in accordance with the terms of such article, of the States of Alaska and Hawaii and any other State having rivers or streams tributary to the Pacific Ocean.

SEC. 2. Article XII of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact, as agreed to by the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, reads as follows:

"ARTICLE XII

"The States of Alaska or Hawaii, or any State having rivers or streams tributary to the Pacific Ocean may become a contracting State by enactment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact. Upon admission of any new State to the compact, the purposes of the compact and the duties of the commission shall extend to the development of joint programs for the conservation, protection and prevention of physical waste of fisheries in which the contracting States are mutually concerned and to all waters of the newly admitted State necessary to develop such programs.

"This article shall become effective upon its enactment by the States of California, Oregon and Washington and upon ratification by Congress by virtue of the authority vested in it under Article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGH VOLTAGE INTERREGIONAL POWERLINES

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am today proposing legislation bearing on the construction of high voltage interregional powerlines. New techniques are being developed for transmitting large quantities of electric power at extra high voltages for much longer distances than heretofore have been possible. Powerlines are being planned that will transmit electricity for 1,000 miles or more. The construction of such lines will have great impact nationally upon our electric industry and upon the widespread utilization of our electric power resources.

The bill I propose would not prevent private utilities from constructing such lines; it would provide only for Federal Power Commission regulation, in order to protect the public interest in major interregional electric interties, so that they can be operated as common carriers.

Recently the FPC, by a divided vote, decided that it does not have legal authority to require certificates of necessity and convenience as a condition to the construction and operation of extra high voltage lines. I believe the Commission should have such authority. I therefore am introducing a bill which would amend the Federal Power Act to grant the Commission such authority with respect to facilities for transmitting electricity in interstate commerce at normal voltages in excess of 230,000 volts.

The bill also provides that persons or companies who, at the time the bill is enacted, already are engaged in operating such extra high voltage lines, will be able to obtain such certificates from the Commission automatically if they apply for them within 90 days. The bill would require the approval of the Commission before any such extra high voltage lines

could be abandoned or curtailed. I hereby introduce it for appropriate reference and consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3432) to amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL OF FORT SCOTT NATIONAL CEMETERY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in 1862 the Fort Scott National Cemetery, Fort Scott, Kans., was authorized by an act of Congress. Fort Scott, Kans., had become an important center for the concentration of Union troops. The authorization by Congress designated the cemetery as National Cemetery No. 1. Fort Scott National Cemetery is the original of the 13 national cemeteries established by the United States.

In November 1962 the centennial of the establishment of this national cemetery will be commemorated in Fort Scott, Kans. I, therefore, introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, to provide for a commemorative stamp honoring the establishment of the U.S. National Cemetery No. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3433) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the centennial of the national cemetery at Fort Scott, Kans., introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 315 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] who had to be in Indiana today, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office.

Senator HARTKE believes it is time to recognize the maturity of the radio and television broadcasting industry by repealing the "equal time" provision of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934.

This provision requires broadcasters to give equal time on their networks and stations to all candidates for any given office.

The provision was suspended during the 1960 election campaign for presidential and vice presidential races. This made possible the historic, precedent-setting radio and TV debates between President Kennedy and his opponent, then, Vice President Nixon. If the pro-

vision had not been set aside temporarily, the networks would have been obliged to make available equal time for any lesser presidential candidates. Networks almost certainly would not have made time available for the classic debates if secondary candidates could have secured equal time. Thus, the radio and television audience—the public, which in effect owns the airwaves—would have been deprived of immeasurable opportunity to see, hear, compare and evaluate presidential candidates.

Within the past few weeks, President Kennedy has urged similar suspension of the equal time provision for the next presidential election—in 1964. A bill to do this has since been introduced in the Senate, and still another that would suspend the provision for this year's election has been introduced, too.

I believe the provision should be repealed, rather than suspended election by election. Repeal would be a well-deserved vote of confidence in the broadcasting industry, which in no way abused the temporary freedom to objectively use its mature sense of fair play in the public interest. Further, repeal of the equal time provision does not diminish or affect the Federal Communication Commission's policy or existing law. This holds that a licensee's statutory obligation to serve the public interest still includes the broad encompassing duty of providing a fair cross section of opinion in the station's coverage of public affairs and matters of public controversy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and that the bill be allowed to remain at the desk for additional cosponsors for 7 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The bill (S. 3434) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office, introduced by Mr. PASTORE (for Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. sec. 315), is amended to read as follows:

"CHARGES FOR USE OF BROADCASTING FACILITIES BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

"SEC. 315. (a) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for public office shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"(b) The Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. The amendment to section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, made by the first section of this Act shall not be construed as relieving any licensee from the obligation imposed upon

him under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM — AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, and Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, KEFAUVER, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, and BURDICK) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: AMENDMENTS TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL, H.R. 11131

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. BARTLETT), I submit three amendments to the military construction bill, H.R. 11131, which we intend to call up at the appropriate time.

The effect of these amendments is to provide that the major portion of construction work undertaken by the Navy in Alaska will be done by civilian contractors rather than by the Seabees, as is currently the practice.

My colleague and I have repeatedly complained to the Department of the Navy that it is manifestly unfair to the civilian economy of Alaska to utilize Seabees for the performance of construction work which civilian contractors are perfectly willing and able to do and for which an ample supply of skilled workers is available. We have received little satisfaction from that Department and have thus felt compelled to seek this method of putting an end to this practice.

We have in Alaska well trained carpenters, plumbers, sheet-metal workers, electricians, masons, painters, plasterers, and other skilled construction personnel who could be used by the Navy for its construction work. We also have in Alaska the highest unemployment rate in the Nation. Both for this and every other reason the use of Seabees in Alaska is inexcusable.

We have been given the excuse that Seabees are used on Adak because it constitutes valuable training for them in a subarctic climate. The Seabees are used extensively by the Navy on Adak, which has a climate comparable to that of Seattle, Wash.

That constitutes the comparison, Mr. President. It is as though the Navy decided to construct housing facilities at the Bremerton Navy Yard using Seabees exclusively and resisting the employment of local contractors and local civilian construction workers on the grounds that the Seabees needed the training under subarctic conditions.

Such an excuse would permit the use of Seabees by the Navy for construction work anywhere in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks copies of the amendments and that they be printed. I also ask that correspondence which we have had with the Department of the Navy concerning this matter, as well as copies of correspondence with individuals in my State complaining about the use of Seabees for this purpose, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and the communications will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 63, line 11, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "Provided, That no substantial part of the construction of such housing shall be performed by Navy personnel."

On page 63, line 19, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "Provided, That no substantial part of the construction of such facilities shall be performed by Navy personnel."

On page 66, line 23, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "Provided, That no substantial part of the construction of such utilities shall be performed by Navy personnel."

NOVEMBER 8, 1961.

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

I have just sent the following telegram to Secretary of the Navy Connally and seek your interest and cooperation in achieving this result.

"Am informed that Navy is programming about \$16 million worth of work at Adak, Alaska, next year. Information I have indicates that about \$6 million will be contracted out and the balance done by Seabees. Alaska is in a critically depressed condition with very substantial unemployment. In fact all Alaska, with the exception of two small areas in southeastern Alaska, has been designated for area redevelopment as a depressed area. I ask your cooperation that priority in employment be given to qualified Alaskan workers, many of whom are available and now unemployed. A gratifying previous experience, during my first month in the governorship of Alaska 21 years ago when work was beginning on the Naval bases at Kodiak and Sitka, with your distinguished predecessor, Navy Secretary Charles Edison, led to a stipulation in the agreement with the contractors that Alaskans should be given at least equal opportunity in the selection of qualified workers on these Alaskan bases. I hope such a policy will prevail under the New Frontier."

ERNEST GRUENING.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Anchorage, Alaska:

Appreciate your concern and desire to reduce critical unemployment in Alaska. Navy does not contemplate accomplishment entire Adak construction program by Seabees. Total program next year about \$6½ million of which Seabees are scheduled to accomplish only about \$1.6 million. Continued employment of Seabees in Aleutians considered essential to operational training and readiness of Seabees for any contingency and therefore in best national interest. Re employment of Alaskan workers, specification requirement not contractually feasible but we will make earnest representations to associated general

contractors and successful bidders on Alaskan projects requesting their cooperation toward achieving your objectives.

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy,
Installations and Logistics.

ALASKA CHAPTER,
ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS
OF AMERICA,
Anchorage, Alaska, November 9, 1961.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We wish to alert you to a situation which has been extremely aggravating to the construction industry for a number of years, and we believe this problem will be of considerable interest to you because of its vital effect on the economy of our State.

For several years, Alaska Chapter of the Associated General Contractors has joined forces with the construction unions in Alaska, in an effort to prevent the Navy from performing unreasonably large amounts of construction work at Adak and Kodiak with the construction battalions, or Seabees. This work has totaled many millions of dollars throughout the years, and although the amount varies each year, the Navy Command appears to be determined to continue the program without cessation or curtailment. As a result of this activity, many Alaska workmen have been deprived of the opportunity to work on construction payrolls during the construction seasons each year.

Last year we were able to obtain some very reliable information which we documented and forwarded to the national office of the AGC, and they in turn discussed this problem at considerable length with a committee of officers from the Bureau of Yards and Docks in Washington. At that time, AGC was assured that there would be a curtailment of this type of program in the future, and this office received further confirmation from the commander of the 17th Naval District at Kodiak. He assured us, through one of his staff officers, that AGC would be kept informed of future Navy construction programs at Kodiak and in the Aleutians. Since that assurance was received last winter, no word has ever been forthcoming from the Navy regarding construction plans for 1962.

Recently one of the construction union officers in Anchorage forwarded certain information to Senator BARTLETT, a copy of which was forwarded to my office. The information received by the Senator caused him to confer with officers of the Navy in Washington, and he was told that there would be no construction at Kodiak in 1962 and that Seabees were being sent to Adak for combat training purposes. This is the same type of story that we have been receiving for several years from the Navy, and in no way indicates any honest intent on their part to cooperate with the people of the State of Alaska in the same fashion they are required to do in other coastal States.

As the result of the letter which was forwarded to Senator BARTLETT, I have made efforts to obtain further information regarding the Navy program for next year. I have just obtained reliable information that the Navy proposes to perform \$16 million of construction at Adak in 1962. Approximately \$6 million of this work will be performed by contract. The remaining \$10 million of the total amount has been designated for work to be performed by the Navy construction battalions, and we have been further informed that these battalions will be sent to the Adak Naval Station during the month of December of this year. Of the very considerable amount of work to be performed by the Seabees in 1962, are the following jobs of which we have knowledge: the rehabilitation of a warehouse and a

hangar, and the rehabilitation of approximately 40 housing units. We have additional information that there will be work performed on the air strip, but we have not been able to obtain information as to the extent of this work.

Certainly the work listed above would not indicate but a small portion of the \$10 million figure. We must, therefore, presume that some major construction work is planned, of which we have so far received no information.

This procedure seems rather ridiculous, inasmuch as Anchorage and other areas in Alaska have been designated as depressed areas, and departments other than the Navy are making efforts to promote a better economy and to reduce the high unemployment that presently prevails. Due to the cutback in military construction during 1961, there are many workmen in the construction labor pools that have been unable to obtain more than a few days work for the entire season of 1961. In the face of all this idleness and the known record of unemployment, the Navy sees fit to ship several battalions of Seabees to the State of Alaska under the guise of combat training. Everyone who has observed the operations of the construction battalions at both Kodiak and Adak are in complete agreement that the work is construction, and cannot be compared with combat training.

I am also submitting this information to Senator Bartlett, Governor Egan, and Representative Rivers, and thought that you would like to be informed of this situation with the possibility you might wish to lend your influence in an effort to correct this situation, and thereby improve the present poor economic picture in our State.

Respectfully yours,

W. S. HIBBERD, *Manager.*

NOVEMBER 8, 1961.

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C.:

I have just sent the following telegram to Secretary of the Navy Connally and seek your interest and cooperation in achieving this result.

"Am informed that Navy is programming about \$16 million worth of work at Adak, Alaska, next year. Information I have indicates that about \$6 million will be contracted out and the balance done by Seabees. Alaska is in a critically depressed condition with very substantial unemployment. In fact all Alaska, with the exception of two small areas in southeastern Alaska, has been designated for area redevelopment as a depressed area. I ask your cooperation that priority in employment be given to qualified Alaskan workers, many of whom are available and now unemployed. A gratifying previous experience during my first month in the governorship of Alaska 21 years ago when work was beginning on the naval bases at Kodiak and Sitka, which your distinguished predecessor, Navy Secretary Charles Edison, led to a stipulation in the agreement with the contractors that Alaskans should be given at least equal opportunity in the selection of qualified workers on these Alaskan bases. I hope such a policy will prevail under the New Frontier."

ERNEST GRUENING.

NOVEMBER 24, 1961.

SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
*U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SECRETARY GOLDBERG: I am writing to you to enlist your support to obtain a reversal in plans on the part of the U.S. Navy to use Seabee construction battalions on projects programed for 1962 at Adak and Kodiak, Alaska.

This is a matter of deep concern to all segments of the community of the State of Alaska. As you know, this State has been

designated for area redevelopment as a depressed area. This designation includes the entire State with the exception of two small areas in southeastern Alaska.

Frankly, Alaska is in a critically depressed condition with very substantial unemployment. During this past summer, which in normal years was a period of high employment, our insured unemployment rate was 2 to 4 percent higher than figures for the same period of 1960.

Our latest figures show that for the week ended November 18 Alaska's insured unemployment rate was 10.8, up from the previous week's 10.2 and higher than the 10.8 for the same week in 1960. The insured unemployment rate for the construction industry is 23.0 with 1,353 men jobless. In addition, many men in the construction labor pool were not able to work more than a few days this year and did not qualify for unemployment benefits.

With the bleak prospect of a steady decline in military construction in Alaska during 1962 and further years, it stretches the imagination to conceive how the Navy can program \$1.6 million in projects for Seabee battalions. The State is also led to believe that projects totaling an additional several million dollars also will be constructed by Navy personnel.

Nationally you have been successful in obtaining no-strike pledges from organized labor involved in the defense projects and bases. However, I strongly feel that this area is a two-way street and the Federal Government has the responsibility of allowing civilian contractors and civilian labor the opportunity to build the needed defense projects.

The Navy has cited two reasons for the utilization of Seabees in Alaskan projects. The Navy has said the projects are of a nature that requires absolute security. This is nonsense as civilian workers have constructed supersecurity stations and bases in the DEW Line, White Alice, etc., for the Air Force across the face of the Arctic and in the shadow of Russia. The Navy has also said the Seabees must remain combat ready and construction work in Alaska is apparently excellent training. These Seabees are not going to be hacking an airfield out of the jungle, but rather engaged actively in the building trades.

In summary may I say that Alaska's civilian construction men are able to measure up to any "security check" the Navy might wish to devise and can produce more efficiently by virtue of their many years of experience than any Seabee. In addition, I do not wish to restate that Alaska has just experienced a severe period of economic slowdown and 1962 foretells even more unemployment.

For these reasons I urge that military construction in Alaska be contracted by civilians and the labor performed by civilians.

Kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

GIL JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Labor.

NOVEMBER 28, 1961.

HON. KENNETH E. BELIEU,
*Assistant Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy, the Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR KEN: This is in further reference to your telegram to Senator GRUENING dated November 17, 1961, concerning the construction contracts to be let by the Department of the Navy for work at Adak.

In discussing this matter with Senator GRUENING (who is in Alaska) by telephone last night, he wanted me to suggest to you that some provision be written into the contracts as finally written along the lines of the statement contained in your telegram that the successful bidders would be asked to cooperate toward the employment of as

many Alaskan employees as possible. While Senator GRUENING realizes that such a provision would not be an auditable contractual requirement, it would, nevertheless, be of significant importance in keeping before the contractors the objective to be sought.

Senator GRUENING would very much appreciate your reactions to this suggestion.

With all best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT W. BEASER.

DECEMBER 20, 1961.

HON. FRED KORTH,
*Secretary of the Navy, Department of the
Navy, Washington, D.C.:*

Military construction is extremely important to the sadly depressed economy of Alaska. As the Navy Department is opening bids in Seattle on December 21 on a contract for large-scale construction at Adak, Alaska, I take this opportunity to reiterate my appeal of November 8 to your predecessor, Secretary Connally, that priority in employment be given to Alaskans on this and all other Alaska contracts. Nearly all of Alaska is suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment. Hiring for Navy work would give its economy a much-needed boost and would provide the Navy with capable and effective employees. Your consideration of this plea will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1961.

MR. HERBERT W. BEASER,
c/o HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: This is in reply to your letter of November 28 asking for my reaction to Senator GRUENING's suggestion that construction contracts for our work in Alaska should contain an expression to the effect that the successful bidder will employ as many Alaskan employees as possible.

We certainly are sympathetic with the Senator's efforts to assure the employment of as many Alaskans as possible, and will make representations to the Associated General Contractors and to successful bidders on Alaskan projects about using Alaskan workers.

However, we are reluctant to include any provision in the contractual document. In the first place, just as you are concerned with the labor surplus situation in Alaska, there are other areas in the United States that have the same problem. This could establish a precedent for inserting expressions about local labor in all contracts.

As a practical matter, since our construction contracts are awarded through the medium of competitive bidding, the successful contractor will look to the Alaskan labor force for his primary labor supply as a matter of economics.

We have given this matter careful thought and consideration, and feel sure that our calling this problem to the attention of the Associated General Contractors and to successful bidders on Alaska projects will result in an improved employment situation.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
*Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).*

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 4, 1962.

HERBERT W. BEASER,
Care of Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
Action Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate,
Anchorage, Alaska:

For your information, reference your wire of December 20 to Secretary Korth. My let-

ter of December 21 to Mr. Beaser, your staff, explains in considerable detail Navy's concern over unemployment problem in Alaska and reasons for our reluctance to include a contract clause requiring preferential hiring of Alaskans. In addition to considerations already mentioned, the Comptroller General has ruled against clauses which would limit the employees who may work on Government contracts. I am hopeful that contract referred to in your wire will provide much relief. That contract, for which bid opening has been postponed till January 10, is a large job which we have every reason to believe will provide employment for many of Alaska's workmen based on demand alone. In addition, however, we trust that the informal efforts of Bureau of Yards and Docks with associated general contractors and with the successful bidder will further improve employment situation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(Installations and Logistics).

JANUARY 5, 1962.

HON. KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations
and Logistics) Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELIEU: In the absence of Mr. Beaser, I wish to acknowledge your telegram following up your letter of December 21 concerning the policy of the Navy Department with respect to employment of native Alaskans for work performed in Alaska. We are grateful for your interest in this matter, and we, too, are hopeful the Adak contract will provide employment for a large number of Alaska workmen. In this connection, it would be very helpful to know how many Alaskans will be employed on this job.

Today a letter was received in this office from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 1281 of Anchorage, Alaska, stating the view that although the Navy intends that most of the work on Adak be contracted and that contractors will be urged to hire Alaskans, the fact is that the greatest part of the work to be performed will actually be done by the Seabees. The business representative of this union states that problem as follows:

"It appears that the Navy is trying to dodge the Seabee issue by urging the contractors to hire Alaskans. The truth is that all the crafts have preferential hiring clauses protecting the Alaskan worker. We have had little or no trouble getting Alaskans on these jobs the past 2 or 3 years. Our real problem is getting the Navy to let these projects to contract. When the contractors do get the work, we do not have to ask for help outside our own organization.

"The Navy still plans to do a large amount of rehabilitation work at Adak with their Seabees. They have doctored their figures and made different quotations, but the fact remains that they still intend to go ahead with the work originally planned.

"The Navy is up to their old trick of double-talking the public again by stating that 'most' of the work will be contracted, and urging the contractors to hire Alaskans. The truth is that there are more man-hours of labor involved in the so-called 1½ that the Seabees are scheduled to accomplish than in the 6½ million they intend to contract. The renovation work always has a far greater percentage of labor, where the new jobs of the type planned usually run a very small percentage in labor; the bulk of the cost being in electronic equipment, and other expensive materials."

In order that we may reply to this union, we shall greatly appreciate your comments on the above quoted remarks.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE SUNDBORG.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1961.

MR. GIL JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Labor,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Your recent letter of November 24 to Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, was referred to my office for information concerning Navy policy regarding the utilization of Naval Construction Forces (Seabees).

The Seabees are deployed to various localities in the world in accordance with existing Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations policy, purely to insure their operational readiness to meet possible construction requirements under any contingency. The present day Naval Construction Forces are a naval operating force in being and as such, must be capable of carrying out their assigned mission in the same manner as any other unit of the U.S. Navy, i.e., a Polar submarine, an underwater demolition team, an aircraft squadron, etc. The active Naval Forces are the ones which will be called upon and must be ready to meet any initial emergency or limited war situation without augmentation of any personnel. In order for all the operating units of the U.S. Navy to be effective they must be adequately trained in all the environments where they may be called upon to operate.

The Aleutians provide one of these environments in which Naval Operating Forces may be required to conduct operations and it is therefore Naval policy to provide training in the Aleutians. This is accomplished not only because it is considered appropriately essential to the national interest, but to insure that the individual may be properly trained to survive, be an effective fighting man and in the case of the Seabee, an effective construction man under subarctic conditions. Security and economy are not primary factors for utilizing Naval Construction Forces in the Aleutians.

During fiscal year 1962 there is a construction program scheduled for Alaska in the amount of \$6.5 million, of which one Naval Construction Battalion will accomplish approximately \$1.6 million and the balance will be undertaken by civilian construction contract. During fiscal year 1963 the program under consideration totals about \$8 million. There has been no determination relative to the amount to be accomplished by the one Naval Construction Battalion to be deployed to the Aleutians during fiscal year 1963, but it should approach an amount of \$1.5 million. As can be seen, of the total amount programmed for fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963, only one construction battalion annually will accomplish about one-fifth of all the work programmed. All the remaining work will be accomplished by civilian construction using civilian labor and not by active-duty naval personnel.

Your concern in these matters is appreciated and I can assure you that Naval Forces are only utilized in such a manner as to effect adequate defense of our country, the free world and freedom.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1962.

HON. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: In response to your letter of January 9, I am providing you with the information you requested, relative to the Seabee Construction Program at Adak, Alaska, for fiscal year 1962.

The major project in the program is the classified Naval facility to be constructed at Adak. This facility will include the construction of three buildings, antennas, and other support features at a cost of \$807,100. Seabees have been utilized on similar projects in other parts of the United States.

In addition to the classified facility, the following projects are to be constructed at Adak by Seabees during 1962:

Project title:	Cost
Rehabilitate runways, taxiways, aprons, hardstand, and drainage facilities, Increment I.....	\$500,000
Necessary storm damage repairs to Yakutat hangar, T-2038 and Birchwood hangar, T-2056.....	5,300
Reshape gravel roads.....	15,000
Rehabilitate Marine rifle range.....	10,600
Structural, mechanical, and electrical rehabilitation of Birchwood hangar, T-2056.....	96,700
Rehabilitate fire alarm system.....	6,100
Locate and mark water distribution system valves.....	None
Repair and rehabilitate Amulet steam distribution system, increment III.....	29,000
Structural and foundation repairs to 124 public quarters....	88,500

I am having the information you requested on the construction program for the last 5 years collected. As soon as it is complete, I will forward the data to you.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

E. J. PELTIER,
Rear Admiral, CEC, USN,
Chief of Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1962.

MR. GEORGE SUNDBORG,
Care of Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SUNDBORG: This is in reply to your letter of January 5, regarding the proposed deployment of U.S. Naval Construction Forces (Seabees), to Alaska during 1962.

Our statement that we would urge our contractors to hire Alaskans on Alaskan projects, although it was not feasible to include this as a contract requirement, was occasioned solely by the request that we take steps to assure preferential hiring of Alaskans. I am happy to note that the unions believe they have made adequate provisions for such preferential hiring.

As previously stated, it is planned that the Seabees will accomplish a \$1.6 million construction program in the Aleutians during 1962. Of this amount, \$800,000 will be devoted to the construction of a classified naval facility, and \$500,000 to the rehabilitation of runways, taxiways, aprons, and hardstands. The remaining funds will be devoted to repair and improvement projects, the two largest of which are the structural, mechanical, and electrical rehabilitation of Birchwood Hangar in the amount of \$96,700 and the structural and foundation repairs to 124 public quarters for \$88,500. Approximately 13 officers and 400 men will be assigned to accomplish this work and conduct other essential operational training.

The Navy's Seabees are deployed to various worldwide locations in accordance with long existing Secretary of Navy and Chief of Naval Operation policy to assure their operational readiness to meet any possible contingency. These Seabee units are the ones that would be called upon to meet any initial emergency, sublimated war, or limited war construction requirement. To assure that they are ready, both as a unit and as individuals, to perform effectively, it is considered essential that they be trained in the environments in which they may be called

upon to operate. The Aleutians area is the only one currently available in which Seabees may learn to live and work under sub-Arctic conditions. Continuing deployment of Seabee units to that area is therefore considered to be in the best national interest.

Your continued concern in these matters is appreciated. I assure you the naval forces are only utilized in such a manner as to effect adequate defense of your country, freedom, and the free world.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1962.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: This is in further reply to your letter of January 9, regarding the construction work performed by the Seabees in Alaska during the past 5 years.

Work during the period from 1957 to 1961 was as follows:

Year	Adak	Kodiak	Total
1957.....	\$426,500	\$697,490	\$1,123,990
1958.....	284,267	349,850	634,117
1959.....	459,120	238,033	696,153
1960.....	345,300	368,500	713,800
1961.....	542,800	256,100	798,900

The following item should be added to the list of work programed for Adak, which was furnished in our letter to you of January 16.

Project title: Complete repairs to RDF site road, NAVCOMMSTA Adak..... Cost \$8,000

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

P. CORRADI,
Rear Admiral, CEC, USN,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: In accordance with your stated desire to be continuously informed relative to the Seabee construction training program and deployment of naval construction forces in Alaska, the following information is being forwarded in addition to that made available in Admiral Peltier's letter to you of January 16, 1962.

There has been no change in the Adak program and accordingly no additional information is available except to advise that the unit assigned to accomplish the work is Mobile Construction Battalion 9. This battalion will deploy in early April and will have a personnel strength at Adak of about 13 officers and 400 enlisted personnel.

The Seabee training program at Kodiak during 1962 will be accomplished by a detachment of Mobile Construction Battalion 9 with a personnel strength of about 3 officers and 100 enlisted personnel. This detachment will also deploy in early April and will accomplish the following projects:

Project title:	Cost
Rehabilitate electrical distribution and telephone communication system.....	\$5,000
Drainage and erosion control for 120 rental housing units.....	15,000
Repairs to grounding system of 450-foot vertical radiator.....	1,300
Total Kodiak program.....	21,300

The expected duration of the 1962 deployments to the Aleutians is about 7 months. As the projected program at Kodiak nears completion, personnel of the Kodiak detachment will rejoin the parent body at Adak.

If any additions or deletions occur relative to the construction and repair program at Adak or Kodiak, you will be advised immediately.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

P. CORRADI,
Rear Admiral, CEC, USN,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1962.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: This is to acknowledge your letter of February 21 and to provide the information promised in my letter of February 16.

Seabees are currently being employed in States other than Alaska on the following welfare, recreation and training projects:

State	Project	Estimated cost
Rhode Island..	Construction of Seabee chapel at the Construction Battalion Center, Davisville.	\$15,000
Do.....	Extension to existing golf course at NAS, Quonset Point.	50,000
California.....	Improvement of barracks showers, Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme.	1,500
Do.....	Construct disaster recovery training area, Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme.	24,800
Do.....	Improvement to spectator area on training beaches, Coronado.	500
Virginia.....	Erect 240 by 100 prefab arch rib buildings, Little Creek.	12,680

Concerning your inquiry for the period 1957-61, records that are available indicate the following work was accomplished in other States:

Year	State	Cost
1957	California.....	\$19,415
1957	Hawaii.....	998,000
1958	California.....	34,600
1958	Hawaii.....	73,000
1959	California.....	40,350
1959	Hawaii.....	28,700
1959	Washington.....	15,750
1960	California.....	48,160
1960	Rhode Island.....	20,000
1960	Maryland.....	100,000
1961	California.....	37,933
1961	Hawaii.....	53,000
1961	New Jersey.....	69,057
1961	Florida.....	27,008
1961	Rhode Island.....	36,356

We trust this report will provide the information you desire.

Sincerely,

R. D. THORSON,
Captain, CEC, USN,
Executive Assistant to Chief of Bureau.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 9, 1962.

Hon. FRED KORTH,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY KORTH: For a long time discussions have gone on and correspondence has been exchanged between the Department of the Navy and the members of the Alaska congressional delegation in reference to construction work by Seabees in Alaska.

Information supplied by the Department of the Navy discloses that \$1,579,600 has been set aside for the Seabee construction program for Alaska for fiscal year 1962. This will involve the largest expenditure during any 1 of the last 6 fiscal years and will be materially higher than any 1 of the last 5 fiscal years. Even though \$807,100 of this amount is earmarked for a classified project at Adak which involves comparatively little labor, the total for Alaska remains very high.

The figures supplied me by Captain Thorson in the letter he wrote March 6, 1962, prove absolutely that our contention was founded on solid fact; namely, that the Navy is utilizing Seabees in Alaska solely because it became used to doing so during Alaska's territorial days, and that private contractors and civilian labor are utilized in the other States, and most probably because the authorities in those States will not tolerate the displacement of private enterprise by a Government agency. It is significant, indeed, that only three Seabee projects are scheduled for the same period in the 48 earlier States and these in a total amount of only \$104,480.

In my opinion—and this is an opinion concurred in by my colleagues, Senator ERNEST GRUENING and Representative RALPH J. RIVERS—the situation has become intolerable. We have sought almost ever since Alaska became a State to bring about a change in Navy Department policy by making factual presentations informally. Our efforts have gotten us nowhere.

Therefore, I see no alternative, unless a new policy is established to be effective following the end of this construction season, to our taking our case to the public by all appropriate means and methods. These would necessarily include statements on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

APRIL 14, 1962.

Hon. FRED KORTH,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Having had the pleasure of meeting you at the luncheon on Friday, I want to take this opportunity strongly to endorse the position taken by my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, in his letter to you of April 9, protesting against the excessive use of Seabees in Alaska work.

In this case, as in the case of so many others, Alaska continues to be the recipient of special treatment not accorded other States, which can only be summed up as discrimination.

It is indeed a holdover from our colonial days, and I want to request most emphatically that work done for the Navy henceforth be done by the accepted methods of private contract, with the employment of qualified Alaskans to whatever extent they are available. This is particularly necessary in view of Alaska's large unemployment percentage—the largest of any State in the Union.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1962.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 9, 1962, relating to the deployment of the Seabees in the State of Alaska.

The peacetime employment of the Seabees, insofar as accomplishment of construction projects is concerned, is predicated upon the need to develop and maintain an acceptable readiness capability for accomplishment of their wartime missions. In the development and maintenance of this capability, en-

vironmental conditions are a major factor. The Aleutian environment, especially that of Adak, provides excellent subarctic conditions. The continued deployment of Seabee units in the Aleutians is therefore necessary to insure a well-balanced operational capability.

Deployment of these units in the Aleutians permits the positioning of a military construction force in the North Pacific area, ready to deploy in the event of any emergency or contingency operation in this region, without delays and problems inherent in transporting such a unit across the Pacific from a distant location.

Such deployments and objectives are wholly in consonance with my own, my predecessors', and the Chiefs of Naval Operations policies for several years.

However, in recognition of the impact of these deployments upon the critical labor problem in Alaska, I have directed that future deployments be critically evaluated to insure the minimum adverse effect upon Alaskan labor employment. Planned deployments are restricted to Adak and to islands in the outer Aleutian chain in consonance with this policy. Exceptions will be limited to classified projects and those which will not adapt to contract accomplishment.

The Seabees are not deployed in the Aleutians either through custom or to compete with private contractors, but instead are so deployed in the national interest as an essential military requirement.

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address prepared by himself for delivery at homecoming, at Hortonville, Wis., on June 16, 1962.

Program and excerpts from address delivered by himself at dedication of West Bend, Washington County, Wis., courthouse, on June 17, 1962.

By Mr. BEALL:

Report compiled by the Library of Congress, relating to State codes and statutes on the selection of local election officials.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article entitled "Big Business in Space: The Case for Government Ownership," written by Senator KEFAUVER and Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, and published in the New Republic magazine for June 11, 1962.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1742. An act to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters; and

S. 2893. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10852) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain

classifications of spun silk yarn, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 4083. An act to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products;

H.R. 4939. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Jasper County, Ga., to the Jasper County Board of Education;

H.R. 5456. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof;

H.R. 7866. An act to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to extend the application thereof to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 8434. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Mount Shasta, Calif.;

H.R. 9736. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit certain property to be used for State forestry work, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10162. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system;

H.R. 10374. An act to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives;

H.R. 10788. An act to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956;

H.R. 10986. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent numbered 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;

H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent numbered 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent numbered 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10852) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING AMERICAN WILDERNESS REGIONS

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Prof. Wallace Stegner of Stanford University has written a stirring article about the importance of preserving the American wilderness regions. I concur wholeheartedly with Professor Stegner's observations and recommendations. His article, entitled "Oh, Wilderness Were Paradise Enow," appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 17. Particularly in view of the fact that the wilderness bill, S. 174, still is pending in the House, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to Professor Stegner's arti-

cle. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OH, WILDERNESS WERE PARADISE ENOW!

(By Wallace Stegner)

(NOTE.—Stegner is professor of English at Stanford University and the author of many novels, including "A Shooting Star" and "Remembering Laughter," which won a Little Brown novelette prize. Because his father had the pioneering itch, Stegner lived for 5 years in Saskatchewan on almost the last frontier. Living in the country gave him an apparently permanent distaste for cities and city ways.)

With the American land disappearing beneath concrete and asphalt at the rate of a million acres a year, the Nation has recently become sharply aware of the need to preserve our few remaining patches of wilderness as pleasuring grounds, as reserves set aside for our country's recreation.

But I should like to urge some arguments for wilderness preservation that involve recreation, as it is ordinarily conceived, hardly at all. Wilderness, surely, offers us the pleasures of hunting, fishing, hiking, mountain climbing, caraping, photography and the enjoyment of natural scenery. So, too, does it provide a genetic reserve, a scientific yardstick by which we may measure the world in its natural balance against the world in its man-made imbalance.

What I want to speak for is not so much the wilderness uses, valuable as those are, but the wilderness idea, which is a resource in itself. Being an intangible and spiritual resource, it will seem mystical to the practical minded—but then anything that cannot be moved by a bulldozer is likely to seem mystical to them. I want to speak for the wilderness idea as something that has helped form our character and that has certainly shaped our history as a people. It has no more to do with recreation than churches have to do with recreation, or than the strenuousness and optimism and expansiveness of what historians call the "American Dream" have to do with recreation.

Something will have gone out of us as a people if we ever let the remaining wilderness be destroyed; if we permit the last virgin forests to be turned into comic books and plastic cigarette cases; if we drive the few remaining members of the wild species into zoos or to extinction; if we pollute the last clear air and dirty the last clean streams and push our paved roads through the last of the silence, so that never again will Americans be free in their own country from the noise, the exhausts, the stinks of human and automotive waste. And so that never again can we have the chance to see ourselves single, separate, vertical, and individual in the world, part of the environment of trees and rocks and soil, brother to the other animals, part of the natural world, and competent to belong in it.

Without any remaining wilderness we are committed wholly, without chance for even momentary reflection and rest, to a headlong drive into our technological termite life, the brave new world of a completely man-controlled environment.

We need wilderness preserved—as much of it as is still left, and as many kinds—because it was the challenge against which our character as a people was formed. The reminder and the reassurance that it is still there is good for our spiritual health even if we never once in 10 years set foot in it. It is good for us when we are young, because of the incomparable sanity it can bring briefly, as vacation and rest, into our insane lives. It is important to us when we are old simply because it is there—important, that is, simply as idea.

We are a wild species, as Darwin pointed out. Nobody ever tamed or domesticated or scientifically bred us. But for at least three millennia we have been engaged in a cumulative and ambitious race to modify and gain control of our environment, and in the process we have come close to domesticating ourselves. Not many people are likely, any more, to look upon what we call progress as an unmixed blessing. Just as surely as it has brought us increased comfort and more material goods, it has brought us spiritual losses, and it threatens now to become the Frankenstein that will destroy us.

One means of sanity is to retain a hold on the natural world, to remain, insofar as we can, good animals. Americans still have that chance, more than many peoples; for while we were demonstrating ourselves the most efficient and ruthless environment-busters in history, and slashing and burning and cutting our way through a wilderness continent, the wilderness was working on us. It remains in us as surely as Indian names remain on the land.

If the abstract dream of human liberty and human dignity became, in America, something more than an abstract dream, mark it down at least partially to the fact that we were in subtle ways subdued by what we conquered.

The Connecticut Yankee, sending likely candidates from King Arthur's unjust kingdom to his Man Factory for rehabilitation, was overoptimistic, as he later admitted. These things cannot be forced, they have to grow.

To make such a man, such a democrat, such a believer in human individual dignity as Mark Twain himself, the frontier was necessary, Hannibal and the Mississippi and Virginia City, and reaching out from those the wilderness; the wilderness as opportunity and as idea, the thing that has helped to make an American different from and, until we forget it in the roar of our industrial cities, more fortunate than other men. For an American, insofar as he is new and different at all, is a civilized man who has renewed himself in the wild.

The American experience has been the confrontation of old peoples and cultures by a world as new as if it had just risen from the sea. That gave us our hope and our excitement, and the hope and excitement can be passed on to newer Americans, Americans who never saw any phase of the frontier. But only so long as we keep the remainder of our wild as a reserve and a promise—a sort of wilderness bank.

As a novelist, I may perhaps be forgiven for taking literature as a reflection, indirect but profoundly true, of our national consciousness. And our literature, as perhaps you are aware, is sick, embittered, losing its mind, losing its faith. Our novelists are the declared enemies of their society. There has hardly been a serious or important novel in this century that did not repudiate in part or in whole American technological culture for its commercialism, its vulgarity, and the way in which it has dirtied a clean continent and a clean dream.

I do not expect that the preservation of our remaining wilderness is going to cure this condition. But the mere example that we can as a nation apply some other criteria than commercial and exploitative considerations would be heartening to many Americans, novelist, or otherwise.

We need to demonstrate our acceptance of the natural world, including ourselves; we need the spiritual refreshment that being natural can produce. And one of the best places for us to get that is in the wilderness where the funhouses, the bulldozers, and the pavements of our civilization are shut out.

Sherwood Anderson, in a letter to Waldo Frank in the 1920's, said it better than I can. "Is it not likely that when the country was new and the men were often alone in the fields and the forest they got a sense

of bigness outside themselves that has now in some way been lost. * * * Mystery whispered in the grass, played in the branches of trees overhead, was caught up and blown across the American line in clouds of dust at evening on the prairies. * * * I am old enough to remember tales that strengthen my belief in a deep semireligious influence that was formerly at work among our people. The flavor of it hangs over the best work of Mark Twain. * * * I can remember old fellows in my hometown speaking feelingly of an evening spent on the big empty plains. It had taken the shrillness out of them. They had learned the trick of quiet."

We would learn it too, even yet; even our children and grandchildren could learn it. But only if we save, for just such absolutely nonrecreational, impractical, and mystical uses as this, all the wild that still remains to us.

It seems to me significant that the distinct downturn in our literature from hope to bitterness took place almost at the precise time when the frontier officially came to an end, in 1890, and when the American way of life had begun to turn strongly urban and industrial. The more urban it has become, and the more frantic with technological change, the sicker and more embittered our literature, and I believe our people, have become.

For myself, I grew up on the empty plains of Saskatchewan and Montana and in the mountains of Utah, and I put a very high valuation on what those places gave me. And if I had not been able periodically to renew myself in the mountains and deserts of western America I would be very nearly bughouse.

Even when I can't get to the back country, the thought of the colored deserts of southern Utah, or the reassurance that there are still stretches of prairie where the world can be instantaneously perceived as disk and bowl, and where the little but intensely important human being is exposed to the five directions and the 36 winds, is a positive consolation. The idea progressively exploited or improved, alone can sustain me.

But as the wilderness areas are, as the jeeps and bulldozers of uranium prospectors scar up the deserts and the roads are cut into the alpine timberlands, and as the remnants of the unspoiled and natural world are progressively eroded, every such loss is a little death in me. In us.

Nevertheless, I am not moved by the argument that those wilderness areas which have already been exposed to grazing or mining are already deflowered, and so might as well be harvested. For mining I cannot say much good except that its operations are generally short-lived. The extractable wealth is taken and the shafts, the tailings, and the ruins left, and in a dry country such as the American West the wounds men make in the earth do not quickly heal. Still, they are only wounds; they aren't absolutely mortal. Better a wounded wilderness than none at all.

And as for grazing, if it is strictly controlled so that it does not destroy the ground cover, damage the ecology, or compete with the wildlife it is in itself nothing that need conflict with the wilderness feeling or the validity of the wilderness experience. I have known enough range cattle to recognize them as wild animals; and the people who herd them have, in the wilderness context, the dignity of rareness; they belong on the frontier, moreover, and have a look of rightness.

The invasion they make on the virgin country is a sort of invasion that is as old as Neanderthal man, and they can, in moderation, even emphasize a man's feeling of belonging to the natural world. Under surveillance, they can belong; under control, they need not deface or mar. I do not believe that in wilderness areas where grazing has never been permitted, it should be permitted; but I do not believe either that an

otherwise untouched wilderness should be eliminated from the preservation plan because of limited existing uses such as grazing which are in consonance with the frontier condition and image.

Let me say something on the subject of the kinds of wilderness worth preserving. Most of those areas contemplated are in the national forests and in high mountain country. For all the usual recreational purposes, the alpine and forest wildernesses are obviously the most important, both as genetic banks and as beauty spots. But for the spiritual renewal, the recognition of identity, the birth of awe, other kinds will serve every bit as well. Perhaps, because they are less friendly to life, more abstractly nonhuman, they will serve even better.

On our Saskatchewan prairie, the nearest neighbor was 4 miles away, and at night we saw only two lights on all the dark rounding earth. The earth was full of animals—field mice, ground squirrels, weasels, ferrets, badgers, coyotes, burrowing owls, snakes. I knew them as my little brothers, as fellow creatures, and I have never been able to look upon animals in any other way since. The sky in that country came clear down to the ground on every side, and it was full of great weathers, and clouds, and winds, and hawks.

I hope I learned something from knowing intimately the creatures of the earth; I hope I learned something from looking a long way, from looking up, from being much alone. A prairie like that, one big enough to carry the eye clear to the sinking, rounding horizon, can be as lonely and grand and simple in its forms as the sea. It is as good a place as any for the wilderness experience to happen; the vanishing prairie is as worth preserving for the wilderness idea as the alpine forests.

So are great reaches of our western deserts, scarred somewhat by prospectors but otherwise open, beautiful, waiting, close to whatever God you want to see in them. Just as a sample, let me suggest the Robbers' Roost country in Wayne County, Utah, near the Capitol Reef National Monument. In that desert climate the dozer and jeep trucks will not soon melt back into the earth, but the country has a way of making the scars insignificant. It is a lovely and terrible wilderness such a wilderness as Christ and the prophets went out in: harshly and beautifully colored, broken and worn until its bones are exposed, its great sky without a smudge or taint from technocracy, and in hidden corners and pockets under its cliffs the sudden poetry of springs.

Save a piece of country like that intact, and it does not matter in the slightest that only a few people every year will go into it. That is precisely its value. Roads would be a desecration, crowds would ruin it. But those who haven't the strength or youth to go into it and live with it can still drive up onto the shoulder of the Aquarius Plateau and simply sit and look. They can look 200 miles, clear into Colorado; and looking down over the cliffs and canyons of the San Rafael Swell and the Robbers' Roost they can also look as deeply into themselves as anywhere I know.

And if they can't even get to the places on the Aquarius where the present roads will carry them, they can simply contemplate the idea, take pleasure in the fact that such a timeless and uncontrolled part of earth is still there.

These are some of the things wilderness can do for us. That is the reason we need to put into effect, for its preservation, some other principle than the principles of exploitation or usefulness or even recreation. We simply need that wild country available to us, even if we never do more than drive to its edge and look in. For it can be a means of reassuring ourselves of our sanity as creatures, as part of the geography of hope.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOVIET OIL MANEUVERS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in South Vietnam, Americans are losing their lives in defense of free world security. In Berlin, allied soldiers face Communist troops and weapons across the grim wall of shame. In all the underdeveloped nations of the world, Soviet technicians and propagandists are working 24 hours a day to undermine the future of the United States.

Mr. President, how much does it take to show that we are in a war and that our economic as well as political policies must be directed toward winning that war? The Soviet Union has never hesitated to use every economic weapon in the arsenal to further its position. Yet, in the free world, there is still a disturbing tendency to think that we can battle the Soviet Union politically but can keep right on dealing with them economically, just as though no struggle existed.

Mr. President, in our struggle we cannot afford to neglect the economic weapon. In fact, it is one of the strongest weapons which the free world possesses, in view of the serious economic crises in which the Communist countries now find themselves.

Mr. President, one of the most effective tools of Russian economic warfare is the export of oil and of oil technicians. In the underdeveloped countries, Russian promises to develop a national oil industry have wide appeal. The result is the expropriation of property belonging to free world enterprises and the influx of Soviet oil, Soviet experts, and Soviet propaganda.

Mr. President, this is what happened in Cuba. It is what is happening in Ceylon right now. Unless the free world comes up with some answers to this Soviet economic strategy, it is going to be harder and harder to achieve economic development and the growth of private enterprise, which are so necessary to economic progress in the poorer nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, following my remarks, two articles from the Sunday New York Times and the Sunday Herald Tribune, discussing the Soviet oil offensive and its very serious implications.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald Tribune, June 17, 1962]

RUSSIAN DRESSING RECALLED

(By Lewis Brigham)

"The fluctuations in the price of crude oil at wells were confined to between 11 and 13 kopecks per pood (70 to 80 cents per barrel

of 42 gallons) for the first half of this year, but advanced gradually until it reached 17 kopecks per pood (about \$1.05 a barrel) in November, and has remained practically at that point until the present."

From kopeck and pood in 1900, when the above was written by the U.S. Consul to Russia, James C. Chambers, for Derrick's Hand Book of Petroleum in Oil City, Pa., to the Soviet's 1962 role as a major threat to the profitability of the world's oil industry, is a long reach.

But, in many ways, it represents a logical return as Russia begins once again to become an important factor on the international oil exporting scene.

Today, Russia, in its world oil commerce, deals in currencies as varied as the Japanese yen and Swedish kroner.

Black Sea oil is tankered to points politically and sociologically as varied as Iceland and Cuba, or Sweden and Japan. Until the last few months, however, price—as measured in kopecks, kroners or what have you—made little difference to Russian oil exporting officials. Their role was primarily political; get the oil into the country on a bargain-basis, and politically we (meaning the U.S.S.R.) have a foot in that nation's door.

This is beginning to change since last fall, though, as the Soviet international oil salesmen drive harder and harder bargains in some parts of the world at least, Japan being the prime example.

PRICE TOO STEEP

Only a week or two ago, for example, a Russian crude oil price boost cost the Soviets the business of at least one Japanese independent oil refiner which discovered it could receive attractive offers from major Middle Eastern oil company sources.

New Asia Oil Co., reportedly, then told the Russians their prices for crude oil were too high in comparison with the Persian Gulf quotes it received.

Reports such as this make the 62-year-old report by the U.S. consul to czarist Russia more meaningful. In 1899, for example, Russia exported some 11 million barrels of oil products throughout the hydrocarbon-dependent world, according to the diary-type account from the diplomat which was uncovered last week when Asiatic Petroleum Co. began moving its library to another floor.

By contrast last year's exports of Russian oil outside the U.S.S.R. amounted to an estimated 615,000 barrels a day. However, the apparent growing concern Soviet officials are placing on price may very well hint at a new economic philosophy, with regard to oil sales, at least.

"There is no doubt whatever that the cost of producing oil at Baku increases steadily; the expense of drilling new wells adds much to this cost, but the greatest increase is due to the increased depth from which the oil must be raised, and the steadily increasing amount of water in the wells," the consul wrote the Oil City man.

This last 1900 commentary by Mr. Chambers would be equally applicable in Tulsa, Houston, or Oklahoma City today. Deep drilling is a highly expensive business and the depths to which modern-day drilling crews go make it to be very costly.

WAS MAJOR POWER

Prior to World War II, Russia was a major oil power in the world, although its basic sales efforts were concentrated on the economically built-up areas of Western Europe.

Following World War II, Russia's role in international oil trade was temporarily eclipsed. But it's staging a comeback now to the point it is in effect demanding that the 14-percent share of the Western European market it held in oil sales prior to 1939 should properly be the U.S.S.R.'s once again.

This challenge alarms not only the Western international oil companies, but the Common Market nations and the NATO military alliance as well, mainly because of the tremendous slug of Russian oil which is pouring into Italy through the state oil agency, ENI.

As a consequence, oil men who feel in a retrospective frame of mind, can hardly be blamed for wishing that the conditions our Diplomat Chambers reported about the Russian oil scene in 1900 were not valid today. For example:

"Some of the wells drilled last year (meaning 1899) have been very unfortunate for the operators. The territory was leased by auction to the highest bidder and the high and advancing price of crude oil made the competition for this territory very great. . . . There were probably three or four times as many wells as would have been drilled upon a like area in any of the fields in the United States."

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1962]

CEYLON OIL MOVES HELD SOVIET GAIN—SEIZURE TERMED REPETITION OF STRATEGY ELSEWHERE

(By J. H. Carmical)

Ceylon furnishes a good example of how easily and cheaply the Soviet Union may take over an established oil market from the big international petroleum companies.

Recently, Ceylon through a new Government-owned company, the Ceylon Petroleum Corp., expropriated certain oil distributing facilities and installations belonging to one British and two United States companies that had operated on the island for 40 years or more.

This action was the result of legislation previously enacted that empowered the Government to form such a company to carry on business as an importer, supplier and distributor of petroleum products. Also, the Government was given the authority to requisition or compulsorily acquire property and to control and regulate the price of oil products. Provision also was made for the payment of any property acquired.

SERVICE STATIONS TAKEN

The taking over of oil installations started at the end of April and is still continuing. So far, some 175 service stations and other terminal facilities have been taken over from the three oil companies, Esso Eastern, Inc., an affiliate of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Caltex (Ceylon), Ltd., a subsidiary of the California Texas Oil Corp., owned jointly by Texaco, Inc., and Standard Oil Co. of California, and Shell Co. of Ceylon, Ltd., owned jointly by the Royal Dutch-Shell group and the British Petroleum Co., Ltd.

Immediately after the acquisition of these installations, oil products from Soviet sources started to arrive and were distributed through them, despite the fact that no payment for the seized properties had been made.

The Ceylon Government announced last week through its Embassy in Washington that contracts had been concluded for the purchase of petroleum products on a long-term basis from the Soviet Union, Rumania, and the United Arab Republic. It stated that these contracts assured supplies for 5 years and that the prices at which oil was now being obtained were a good deal lower than those at which the oil companies had been importing it.

The Ceylon Embassy further stated that arrangements to pay for the petroleum have been so adjusted that there would be no drain on Ceylon's foreign assets and that the rupee credit accruing to the supplying countries would be used for the purchase of Ceylon's export products.

This is pretty hard competition for any oil company in the non-Communist world to meet. It is simply a barter arrangement

between two governments. However, the Embassy said the Ceylon Government was prepared to purchase petroleum products from any country in the world, provided the terms were not less advantageous than those already obtained by its Government-owned property.

Protests by both the United States and British Governments were lodged against Ceylon for its action, but they resulted in no apparent change. In the post war period, Ceylon has been a heavy recipient of foreign aid from the U.S. Government, and it had been thought that a protest by the U.S. Department of State would receive some recognition.

OVERALL TREND NOTED

Those who have been studying the Ceylon development for the last few months are convinced that the sale of oil products to that country is only of secondary importance. They regard it as a clever move to undermine private enterprise methods and to influence political decisions in the country. At stake also is the important port of Colombo, with its bunkering facilities and an all-weather deep-sea harbor.

The Ceylon Embassy referred to the bunkering facilities at Colombo in its statement, but said the oil companies had not been in a position to withhold supplies arbitrarily from certain parties.

"Ceylon is an independent country, pursuing its chosen foreign policy," the embassy said, "and no matter who owned the bunkering facilities . . . the determination as to whether or not these facilities should be denied any country is a sovereign decision resting with the Government and not within the competence of the oil companies."

With the bunkering facilities at Colombo now stocked with Soviet oil, there is little doubt that any Soviet bloc vessel now entering that port will be serviced.

NO SOVIET SHIPS FUELED

As a matter of fact, Soviet bloc vessels have not been refueled at any port east of Suez by U.S. oil companies. This stems from the continued refusal of captains of these ships to disclose the nature of their cargo to U.S. authorities.

Under Ceylon's recent contracts for oil products, it is reasonably certain that only Soviet oil is included. Although one contract with the United Arab Republic is cited, Egypt basically is an oil importing nation, although it has some production and also some refineries. Through its barter arrangements with the Soviet Union, however, it probably has some excess oil for sale in the world market and it is quite possible that some of this oil is involved in the Ceylon deal.

With some surplus cotton to dispose of in the world market, this may be a several-pronged barter deal. The Soviet Union will take the cotton in exchange for oil. The oil then will be sold to Ceylon by Egypt. In turn, it is quite possible that some of the cotton received by the Soviet Union will be reoffered in the free world market.

TRADE PATTERN VIEWED

The chief exports of Ceylon are natural rubber, tea, and coconut products. In the past, these have been coming to the United States in fairly large quantities and have amounted to roughly three times what the United States has sold in Ceylon. Under the new Soviet oil contract, the Soviet Union undoubtedly will receive these products in exchange for oil and some may be reoffered for sale, probably at a discount, here and in other countries.

Involved in the relatively simple barter deal between the Soviets and Ceylon are many items that have both political and economic significance. And Ceylon is not an isolated instance, for the Soviet oil offensive is moving ahead at a brisk pace.

The oil companies are at a decided disadvantage in coping with it alone. Dealings are between governments and about the only thing the oil companies can do is to protest and this invariably is ignored.

OILMEN FRUSTRATED

British Shell recently described the situation in Ceylon as "amazing and deplorable," and said the Government-owned company simply says: "We want to buy this or that, which you are using for your business and if you don't sell we will seize it. Also, if you don't agree to sell whatever piece of your property we ask for, you will be publicly accused of being uncooperative."

The petroleum resources of the Soviet Union are enormous. They are being developed rapidly and additional pipelines and other facilities are being built to press these on the world market. With no taxes, dividends, or royalty payments to make this oil being offered at a price at which the international companies would go bankrupt if they tried to compete.

In some cases if the oil companies don't compete and cut their prices to the low levels charged by Soviets, such as in Ceylon, they end with their properties being seized and then used for the distribution of Soviet oil products. This also happened in Cuba where refineries and marketing facilities were taken over by the Castro government. Outside Western Europe, Cuba probably is the biggest buyer of Soviet oil today.

REFINERIES COSTLY

To build refineries and establish marketing outlets is a costly venture. It is estimated that it costs \$3,000 in refinery, transportation, and marketing facilities to market a barrel of oil a day. This is in addition to the cost of producing the crude oil.

Now, the Soviet Union has devised a system through which the so-called capitalistic countries pay for the marketing costs. It is very simple. Offer local governments oil at much cheaper prices than the international companies can sell it, whip up some nationalistic feelings and include some propaganda about imperialistic economy and they soon have a situation to their liking.

At present, the Soviets are busy in a dozen or more countries aiding local governments in obtaining oil supplies. When the proper atmosphere has been created, they will take over and another Cuba or Ceylon will emerge, but always by degrees.

URBAN AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several days ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] delivered a most perceptive and important address before the American Society for Public Administration, in New York City. His address focused on the relationship between rural, urban, and suburban areas, and makes very clearly the point that it is the suburban voter who is most seriously under-represented in our Government.

The Senator from New Jersey suggested in his remarks that the failure of the administration to key its proposed Department of Urban Affairs to suburban as well as urban needs was one of the principal reasons for its defeat in the Congress. He urges that the administration press again for action on a Department to coordinate the several activities of Government to meet certain basic needs of our Nation's metropolitan areas.

Mr. President, this address by a serious and able proponent of a Department of Urban Affairs is, I believe, of major significance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Senator's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, OF NEW JERSEY, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, SHERATON-ATLANTIC, NEW YORK CITY, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1962

On March 26, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the apportionment of the Tennessee State Legislature could be challenged in the Federal courts by the citizens of that State. The decision was precedent-shattering.

Many reached the conclusion that the decision spells the eventual end of rural overrepresentation not only in State legislatures but also in Congress. Congressional Quarterly, generally regarded as the authoritative reference on Congress, has prepared a study of this question.

It confirms the fact that rural areas are, indeed, heavily overrepresented in the U.S. House of Representatives. But it finds that, contrary to the prevailing view, urban areas are not nearly as badly underrepresented in the House as are suburban areas.

The publication's study of the population characteristics of all current House districts fails to support the theory that an ideal reapportionment of congressional seats would bring major changes in the political complexion of the House.

Today, urban areas make up 126 House seats. Congressional Quarterly's ideal reapportionment would mean a gain of only seven urban seats.

The suburbs, on the other hand, are represented by only 60 House seats. The suburbs, ideally, would gain 20 seats by a proper reapportionment.

Rural areas, on the other hand, control 250 House seats. Under an ideal reapportionment, they would lose 27 seats.

These figures seem to indicate that even if the ideal were reached, it would not make an essentially rural House of Representatives into a more urban-minded body, at least not overnight.

Where does this leave us? We are left with a Congress which is likely to remain are not hopeful about its chances for passage for perhaps another 2 years.

In this context, I would like to discuss the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing—what went wrong with the effort and what might be done to put the issue to Congress on a sounder basis than it was presented this past spring.

Administration leaders with whom I have spoken since the reorganization plan to establish the new Department was defeated are not hopeful about its chances for passage for perhaps another 2 years.

Several things went wrong with the administration's plans. Among the less-publicized ones, in my opinion, the administration placed nearly its entire emphasis on what the new Department would mean for the cities and the cities alone. I believe that insufficient emphasis was placed on the burgeoning problems of our suburbs, underrepresented as they are, beset with growing pains as they are, created by and yet the victims of the surge by millions of inhabitants of the central cities for the greener life.

For some years now, America has been changing from a predominantly rural to an essentially urban Nation. In the transformation, we have witnessed a shocking deterioration of many urban areas.

Over the past three decades, both Republican and Democratic administrations have supported programs of slum clearance and urban renewal, mortgage insurance for homeowners, home improvement loans, low-rent public housing, purchase and sale of mortgages to stabilize the market and provide liquidity for mortgage investments, loans for public facilities, for public works planning, for housing for the elderly, for housing of college students, and a wide range of other activities.

At the same time, the Federal Government has sought, and properly so, to encourage the solution of urban problems through State and local action, including areawide regional and interstate cooperation. It provides, for example, grants to assist small communities as well as regional and metropolitan areas for comprehensive planning.

In this area, the activities of the Federal Government are not sufficiently coordinated. The welter of agencies dealing with city problems often obscures objectives. One arm of the Government finds itself at odds with the goals of another.

Here lies one of the great potential advantages of a new Department. For the Department should be in a position to coordinate the multiplicity of Federal programs which have as their purpose the promotion of orderly community planning and growth.

In areas such as ours, the problem is not only of the central city, but of the younger suburbs struggling to avoid engulfment by the same planning problems which have already brought many older suburbs to the point of decay. It is a problem of urban sprawl, of haphazard suburban growth. Twenty years ago, did we dream that a fine suburban community like Montclair, N.J., would require urban renewal programs to stamp out blight? Or that some of the older towns near the Delaware River would be submitting plans for overhauling their downtown areas?

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the administration plan was its failure to bring all the programs affecting an urban society under one administrative roof. For all the administration plan proposed was to raise the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level. Yet HHFA hardly covers the range of problems confronting urban and suburban communities.

Air and water pollution problems, for example, plague many a community and, today, these are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As urban life becomes more complex, the controversy often grows sharper between highway planners, whose concern is often exclusively with traffic needs, and the local housing authorities, whose objective is to avert new slums while they wrestle to replace existing ones. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States and localities, provides funds for each.

There are problems, too, with regard to the relative importance of highways and mass transit in the urban scheme of things. Duplication and waste will inevitably follow if elaborate mass transit plans are centered in the new Department while another Federal agency—the Department of Commerce—has exclusive jurisdiction over urban and suburban roads.

Responsibility needs to be centered in one place if we are to make the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar for meeting overall community needs. We will continue to have difficulty in getting wise decisions under divided responsibility.

I propose that a commission be appointed by the President to determine which of these presently fragmented functions of Government should be brought under the roof of the new agency.

If we have a delay in reconsideration of the need for a new department, we should

make maximum use of the time available to us by strengthening the reorganization plan.

These aspects have not been sufficiently stressed. There has not been enough political support for the concept from the suburbs.

We need to make it clear that suburbia has a vital stake in this legislation. If the planning problems and fiscal needs of suburbia can be reviewed by one agency, it will not be at the cost of local and State home rule. Centering already available assistance and existing functions in one agency will stimulate local governments to develop comprehensive plans for the solution of area-wide problems.

We have time to come up with a better plan. And we have the ability to find one. Above all, the need is there and it is pressing.

GOLD PRICE RISE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the other day there came to my attention an address made to the stockholders of Dickenson Mines, Ltd., of Canada, by President Arthur W. White. In reporting to his stockholders President White said among other things, "an increase in the price of gold is unavoidable."

I could not agree more. It is inevitable.

And I am convinced that all of the dire consequences which so many would predict for the United States if the price of gold were to be raised simply would not occur.

Mr. President, because he spoke logically on a subject of such great importance to Alaska and to so many other Western States, I ask that pertinent parts of Mr. White's address be printed in the RECORD, so that my colleagues may read them.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

GOLD AND THE FUTURE

So much has happened throughout the world these past few years that we cannot comprehend the tremendous developments and changes that have taken place, even within our own country. The conquest of outer space is now recorded history, merely one more chapter of man's amazing achievements, and but the forerunner of many more scientific breakthroughs yet to come in this new space era.

And in the sphere of economic developments, events are moving swiftly. Today's world is being compacted by instant travel and mass communication, and by the intermixing of international capital, know-how, and culture. There is a new and growing awareness of the need and necessity of living and prospering together as one big family of nations; there is an evident desire to expand the interflow of trade and travel; and there is an awakening realization that the problems of today, and tomorrow, can and must be solved without recourse to war.

The world today is in a tense yet hopeful phase of economic readjustment. The wartime surge in the North American productive structure has overtaken pent-up postwar demands. Other nations have rebuilt and modernized their industrial facilities. The once prostrate nations of Western Europe have joined forces, the European Economic Community is prospering, has substantial and increasing monetary reserves and sound currencies. This great experiment in commonsense economics has set an example which is a real challenge to all nations.

The rapidly changing patterns of trade and political conflict point up the desire and

the determination of all countries, big and small—regardless of ideologies—to gain access to the marketplace. The widening channels of world trade will bring greater understanding. Through the opening doors of global enterprise the wants and aspirations of the less fortunate and newly emergent nations can best be fulfilled—and hope advanced for peaceful coexistence in the years ahead.

The most important requirement, the master key to favorable developments in the future overall scheme of things, is a more workable system of international payments. Currencies must be solid, sound, and stable, and beyond the caprice of political wizardry. Good currency is not a matter of mechanics alone, but dependent primarily upon good government and intelligent internal policies. Right now there is nervousness and uncertainty overhanging the world currency picture. The U.S. dollar, sterling, and other currencies, including the Canadian dollar, are under pressure; and the so-called parities (as related to the U.S. dollar) are not in all cases realistic. Gold convertibility, to some degree, is suspended through the stockpiling of dollars and sterling by the more affluent continental nations.

Last June when Finance Minister Fleming announced the Government's intention of devaluing the dollar it was felt by many like myself that the action was long overdue. As I pointed out at our last two annual meetings, Canada's adverse and chronic balance-of-payments position never did warrant the dollar trading at a premium. Not only was our currency the only one quoted at a prewar premium but Canada was perhaps the only country which had not devalued in term of the U.S. dollar.

Devaluation of any currency causes some disturbance generally. So far as Canada is concerned the final results have yet to be determined. This action has not been good news for a lot of people, especially the foreign investor who has a very large stake in this country, and therefore is keenly interested in what goes on here. The heavy inflow of U.S. capital alone, in recent years has been a very big factor in the phenomenal development of both our primary and secondary industries—and no one will question the helpful effect that all this capital has had on our economy.

Whether or not the long-term benefits of the discount dollar will exceed the more immediate tugs and pulls is a matter of wait and see. Mining and other primary industries will gain considerably. This dynamic sector of the economy has always formed the foundation of our national enterprise, and here the immediate benefits will be worth while. For most gold producers the benefits are a real shot in the arm. In the final analysis, it is mandatory that we maintain the respect and confidence of everyone, even if to do so means getting back to fundamentals. We all know that excessive government spending, high taxation, and deficit financing choke and strangle incentive and healthy growth.

Monetary difficulties are not peculiar to Canada alone. The effects of creeping inflation, unbalanced budgets and intensifying balance-of-payments problems are general, except possibly within the European Economic Community. The advocates of managed currency are more and more being faced with the realization that even perfect economic theories clash with political expediency. To say that an increase in money supply is a cause of inflation is true, to say that the only way to avoid inflation is to avoid deficit budgeting is also true—both are true statements. The trouble starts when we try to mix the two, try to mix economics with politics. Managed currency has failed because management has failed. The pleas of necessity have overridden the demands of restraint. The have-it-now, pay

later exponents have ignored the simple truths, namely, that spending does not create prosperity, that borrowing does not pay debts.

Another thing we have learned is that no matter what we do at home, we must pay as we go in our foreign dealings. Our dollar is worth only its purchasing power at home, worth only merchandise elsewhere. The coin of international account is the U.S. dollar or gold. That is why today many nations are struggling to meet the deficit in their foreign dealings and having to resort to extreme measures. For example, last June, Britain raised the discount rate to 7 percent in an effort to encourage an inflow of funds and thereby restore depleted gold reserves. Renewed emphasis is being placed on increasing exports in the face of much stiffer competition.

Out of all this turbulence one historic fact emerges, gold is the world's most wanted commodity. There is no substitute for gold. Gold is to finance what ballast is to a ship. Adequate gold reserves are a basic requirement of every nation and maintenance of such reserves will demand more rigid discipline in fiscal policies. For years the economic magicians have been asking "why waste good money to dig gold out of one hole only to bury it in another at Fort Knox?" For years we have been hearing them tell us that gold is a barbarous relic, an outworn dogma. In my opinion, ladies and gentlemen, these false prophets have had their day. Gold has regained its ages-old prestige as the ultimate standard of value, the one true medium of exchange.

In February 1961, when the U.S. dollar was under heavy pressure, President Kennedy in his balance-of-payments message to Congress, listed the resources and measures available for defending the Nation's currency and checking the outflow of gold. These measures, he said, would symbolize a new dimension of the Nation's foreign and domestic policies. Now, 16 months later, the problem has intensified, gold reserves have been further depleted—to the lowest level since 1939. Pressures are building up. Outstanding dollar claims are substantial.

We all know that United States is a strong, resourceful nation, a great international benefactor, our last bastion of defense. But with worldwide investments and financial commitments, and as the key-currency nation, the United States must of necessity maintain abundant stocks of gold. The persistent outflow cannot continue very much longer. At some point, something will have to happen.

An increase in the price of gold is unavoidable. Regardless of all, or any, forms of international support, the United States will ultimately be forced off the \$35 gold basis—unless there is a very sudden reversal in the balance-of-payments position. The future is not promising. This whole subject is very serious and complex. It would be unfortunate if by increasing the price, other currencies collapsed. But would that necessarily be the result? To say an increase in the price of gold is in reality devaluation of the dollar is an open question. To say it would bring on severe inflation is debatable. Things did not work out that way the last time the price was increased—in 1934. If increasing the price of gold means more inflation, then by the same reasoning, a decrease in the price would bring deflation.

Gold is a commodity, subject under free competitive conditions to the inexorable laws of supply and demand. The scarcity of a commodity gives it value; gold has become scarcer, there is not enough to go around. Gold has increased in value but not in price—and that is the essence of the whole thing.

Gold is a commodity, an article of value and as such should be available to anyone who can afford to buy it. This is a way of

life, a means of storing value. In years gone by people had the choice of gold, or paper currency, or both. But since 1934 most governments have reserved the privilege of holding and dealing in gold as a state monopoly. There are a few exceptions—mostly in Continental Europe. Canada, in 1956, restored the privilege of free markets but there is no gold coinage. Of course, if coins were minted, government gold holdings would be decimated and dispersed. In other words, there just isn't enough gold to permit such a thing, which is just one more way of saying gold is under-priced. Let it not be forgotten that the oldest gold coin is worth more today than when minted, and is still readily acceptable as money anyplace in the world.

Gold is not in oversupply, never has been, and is not apt to be. Official gold holdings, outside Russia and her friends, amount to about \$40 billion. Production of new gold in 1961 was only about \$1.2 billion, of which South Africa produced two-thirds. Canada accounted for only 13 percent of the total. In the United States growing industrial requirements already exceed double the domestic output. Somewhat less than one-half of newly mined gold is reaching official holdings.

The essential quality of gold is that it constitutes purchasing power—is a demand for goods—at home or anywhere in the world, and is acceptable without compulsion and without limit for all other commodities.

Gold will never be replaced; gold is where it is because of the law of supply and demand. And because costs have gone up, gold must go up. When the price does go up there will be a startling revival of interest in the Canadian gold mining industry. Canada needs gold—and will need more. Gold is one thing we know we can sell—and export, even in times of a depressed economy. What gold has done for Canada, in pushing back the frontiers, in creating new communities and cities, is a well-known and glowing record of resourceful initiative. These living symbols of real wealth-creating enterprise contribute greatly to the well-being of the whole Nation.

I need not repeat the long standing and valid arguments so often put forward these past few years in support of claims for a better price for gold. We have come through some trying times. Now as a result of devaluation the Canadian producer will receive about \$38 per ounce for his gold compared with the past 9-year average of about \$34. This substantial increase is going to help considerably. However, when the justified increase in the U.S. price of gold finally comes, then the industry will really take off.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SEABEES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year marks the 20th anniversary of one of the Navy's most distinct and honored components. I am referring, of course, to the Seabees who have had their headquarters at the Construction Battalion Training Center in Davisville, R.I., since they were first organized in 1942. Rhode Island has a long history of providing facilities for our Navy, and, therefore, all Rhode Islanders share in the justifiable pride which the Seabees have in themselves.

Mr. President, the June 1962 edition of *Construction Craftsman*, has an excellent article on the Seabees, written by Adm. Peter Corradi, and I ask unanimous consent that this stimulating article be placed in the body of the *RECORD*. As Admiral Corradi points out, the duties

of the Seabees have changed somewhat since World War II, but there is no doubt that they continue to personify their fine motto, "can do."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SEABEES REMINDER OF ROLE OF CRAFTSMEN—CONSTRUCTION BATTALIONS STILL WAGE "CAN DO" PROGRAM AROUND THE WORLD

(By Rear Adm. P. Corradi, CEC, U.S. Navy, Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks)¹

Recruited for temporary service during World War II, the Navy's construction battalions—the famous Seabees—this year are celebrating their twentieth anniversary as a permanent, and indispensable, part of the Navy. During the two decades of their existence they have performed astonishing deeds, earned innumerable tributes, and established themselves as one of the most colorful, capable and consistently ingenious branches of America's military force.

The Seabees were born of dire necessity. In the days just before the war began a great deal of construction was underway at naval bases in the Pacific, such as Guam, Midway, and Wake Islands. It became apparent to Adm. Ben Moreell, then Chief of BuDocks, that, should war break out, the contractors' workmen then engaged in this construction work would be completely defenseless. Under the Geneva Convention, as civilians they would either have to surrender to invading forces or take arms and risk the chance of being executed as guerrillas.

With this in mind, Admiral Moreell received permission to begin organizing "Headquarters Construction Companies" to be utilized by officers in charge of construction at advance bases as administrative units in case war interrupted contract operations. One such company had been organized by December 7, 1941.

When the attack in the Pacific occurred, Admiral Moreell obtained permission to recruit and form construction battalions to accomplish wartime buildup of advance bases.

The need was immediate, and grew by leaps and bounds. There was little time to train men. Experienced tradesmen who could jump in and get the job done were required.

Admiral Moreell worked with his friend, Richard J. Gray, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department, American Federation of Labor. It was agreed that such uniformed men would not be employed on projects within the continental United States, except in cases of highly classified or training projects—an agreement that has been kept both in war and in peace. Mr. Gray plunged into the task of recruiting experienced union men for the new organization. The Navy offered them ratings based on their experience.

As fast as the early volunteers enlisted—their average age was 35—they were shipped out to the Pacific and put to work in forward areas.

Immediately stories began to spread over the South Pacific and back to the States of the prodigious accomplishments of these men whose slogan was "Can Do" and whose

¹Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, CEC, USN, became Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy, February 1, 1962 after more than 21 years of distinguished service in the Navy. He had been identified with a number of spectacular engineering projects in civilian life. He served in the Pacific in World War II and holds numerous decorations. He speaks with authority on the work of the Seabees under fire—he has been under fire with CB units in the South Pacific.

spirit was one of riotous confidence mixed with ingenuity.

There were times when their methods were a bit unorthodox—as when they employed the technique known as the “moonlight requisition” to get equipment that was not available in the daytime—but they always got the job done, and invariably ahead of time.

What was equally interesting, they always ate as well as or better than anyone else in the service and seemed to enjoy more of the comforts of home than were available to other, less inventive mortals. The 50-gallon oil drum became a washing machine, a culvert, or seemingly anything else the human mind could think of. Showers appeared in unlikely places and Seabee quarters always became the most livable of their kind.

The nickname, “Seabee,” was coined by an artist at the construction battalion training center at Davisville, R.I. On March 5, 1942, the construction men were officially given permission to call themselves Seabees and wear the distinctive shoulder patch—the fighting mad bee with tools in his middle and rear feet and a machine gun in the forefeet—that has now become a symbol of American construction ingenuity. This is the date, therefore, that is recognized as the real birthday of the Seabees.

A great deal has been written about the wartime exploits of the Seabees. General MacArthur remarked that, “The only trouble with the Seabees was that there weren't enough of them,” and other leaders of the military forces said equally complimentary things about them.

When an emergency did appear, in Korea, the Seabees manned the pontoon causeways that made the landings at Inchon. Later, it was Seabees who landed the Marines at Lebanon.

When the men who saw service in World War II were discharged, the great majority of the Seabees went back to the jobs in the building trades they had worked on before the war. Many of them are still busy at those jobs. And a great number of them, besides being prominent in union activities, also are very active members of Seabee Reserve companies.

Some Seabees chose to remain in the Navy, and served as tutors of the later recruits. Many of these World War II veterans are the chief petty officers who lead the younger men in accomplishing today's outstanding projects. At the same time they have instilled in the new men something of the same spirit that distinguished the original “Bees.”

The result is that in many parts of the world, the naval construction battalions are still performing in the same amazing manner as their predecessors, even though they do not command the publicity now that they did in wartime.

In Okinawa, for example, our construction battalions have built a Marine Corps air facility using concrete precasting methods that aroused the admiration of contractors in the Pacific area.

At Holy Loch, Scotland, there were Seabees manning the drydock for the Polaris submarine facility in the news a while ago.

And in far-off Antarctica, a group of Seabees recently earned a round of tributes for the manner in which they installed the first nuclear reactor powerplant at McMurdo Station, despite the weather conditions that are laughingly called “summer” in that forbidding region.

A small detachment of Seabees last year supervised and instructed Ecuadorans in modern American construction methods while building a new Ecuador Naval Academy.

As you can see, the type of work the Seabees are engaged in has changed to some extent in the years since World War II. Certainly, the method of manning the battalions has changed. For today's Seabee is

younger and less experienced than his wartime predecessor when he joins the battalions. But the results that he and his fellow Seabees achieve are ample demonstration that the ability of American workmen has not lessened. They are still the world's master builders.

HONG KONG REFUGEE SITUATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Hong Kong harbors the world's largest single concentration of refugees from a Communist-controlled country. In the past few weeks we have been reading and hearing a great deal about the situation there, and the plight of Chinese refugees causes genuine concern and sympathy in the hearts and minds of all Americans.

Early this year, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, directed its staff to inquire into the refugee problem in Hong Kong and Macao. Reports indicated that as early as August and September 1961, an increasing number of Chinese refugees was seeking asylum in these areas. Events over the past few weeks, however, have particularly pointed up the urgency of the subcommittee's inquiry. To facilitate this inquiry, to inform more fully the Congress and the American people, and to help define America's responsibility in Hong Kong, the subcommittee opened hearings on May 29. At this time, testimony in open and executive session was received from the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Averell Harriman, and the State Department's Director of Refugee and Migration Affairs, Mr. Richard Brown. Last week the subcommittee heard representatives of the voluntary agencies working in Hong Kong. Additional testimony will be received later this month.

Our response to the refugee challenge in Hong Kong, Mr. President, must be made within a framework of responsibility. The head as well as the heart must dictate our actions. In this connection, it seems to me that at least several observations are in order. In the first place, even though Hong Kong's refugee problem generates a humanitarian concern among all Americans, we must also bear in mind that we are confronted here with a problem that is under the general jurisdiction of the British Government and the specific jurisdiction of the local Hong Kong authorities. Consequently, America's response to the Hong Kong situation must be calculated, in the final analysis, by determinations of British authorities. It is of interest to note that until last Wednesday, the Hong Kong authorities, who display exemplary actions in dealing with refugees, had not found it necessary to make a direct appeal to free world nations for assistance.

Let me add here, Mr. President, that political relationships are involved in our response to the Hong Kong situation, not only relationships with our trusted ally, Great Britain, but also those with Nationalist China and other countries in Asia and elsewhere. I do not exclude in this context our nonexistent relationships with the Peiping regime on the Chinese mainland. It seems to me that

Hong Kong is a kind of West Berlin in Asia. Unquestionably, the situation here is politically complex, requiring much thought, and involving delicate issues and the security of the free world.

A second observation, Mr. President, is that the overt cause of our present concern, the recent heavy influx of refugees into Hong Kong, has merely served to highlight an already serious refugee problem in the crown colony. Hong Kong is really the only exit from the Chinese mainland to freedom and security. For over a decade Hong Kong has thus harbored anti-Communist refugees—at an average rate of some 50,000 persons annually. This year the number has already surpassed the 50,000 mark. So the problem in Hong Kong is not of a temporary nature. It has been there for many years. And so long as tyranny rules the Chinese mainland, the influx of refugees into Hong Kong will continue.

The government of the crown colony receives no subsidy from the United Kingdom. But over the years and with the assistance of numerous voluntary agencies, at least 10 of which are American, the government has strained its resources and ingenuity to approach a solution to the refugee problem in Hong Kong. Since 1953, these efforts have been assisted through our Far East refugee program and generous grants of Public Law 480 agricultural commodities. So a great deal has been accomplished for the refugees in Hong Kong, and a solid foundation has been laid for the continued efforts of the free world.

A third observation, Mr. President, is that the recent tide of refugees sweeping into Hong Kong reflects growing unemployment on the mainland, food shortages, a widespread apprehension of famine in the near future, and serious general dislocations in every sector of the Chinese Communist system. In short, the refugees depict the failure of communism and the agony of China.

Now governments have a way of turning these conditions into a national asset. To what extent the Chinese people are being used as a political or psychological weapon is difficult to determine. But the suddenness with which the recent surge of refugees began and ended, shows the official connivance of the Peiping Government. So our action in this situation is not without serious implications for our security in the Far East.

In thinking of an approach to the refugee problem in Hong Kong, and the extent of America's responsibility, we should do well to project our thoughts beyond today's emergency situation and momentarily expedient relief measures. The challenge in all refugee problems is the task of providing effective asylum to bewildered people, commensurate, of course, with available resources. It is the task of creating the best possible conditions of the refugees to live reasonably normal and productive lives, to be self-reliant and free from the shackles of a tortured past.

On the basis of testimony and other information available to the subcommittee, it would appear that the best approach to the problem in Hong Kong

lies in fostering the local rehabilitation and integration of the refugee population. This is, admittedly, a gigantic task, and no one can measure accurately the future dimensions of the problem. But circumstances dictate this course of action—at least for the major portion of the refugee community. The Hong Kong government has made tremendous strides in this direction. But additional energy must be expended to get over the hump of the refugee problem. The following areas of assistance should be fully explored with the British Government:

First. An expanded general program of local resettlement and rehabilitation. I am thinking here of emergency relief programs, English language and vocational training programs, self-support projects, and medical assistance. The experience and resources of the voluntary agencies can be of particular importance in this regard.

Second. Active free world support for Hong Kong's program of capital construction. Just this week, and for the first time in its history, the Hong Kong government has invited other governments interested in the refugee problem to contribute funds to this long-range program. The Hong Kong government indicated a limitless need of assistance, and said contributions could be used especially to provide more water, roads, housing, hospitals, clinics, community centers, and schools. I hope we give serious consideration to this appeal from our friends in the Far East, and suggest, Mr. President, that we make immediate contribution of \$1 million to this program of capital construction just as we did during World Refugee Year.

Third. Assurance from the free world of a reasonable access to markets for the limited range of goods Hong Kong produces. Trade is the lifeblood of Hong Kong's economy. It is the key to the colony's ability to provide the refugees a livelihood. Hong Kong will develop and survive only if her trade can be maintained with an adequate scope for growth. This is a complex problem, Mr. President, and the Refugee Subcommittee defers to the appropriate committees of the Senate for further study of this aspect of the problem. But as we study the situation and make our determinations, I hope that we will consider the future as well as the present.

Hong Kong is a strategic outpost of freedom in a sensitive area of the world, and its survival will depend largely upon a viable economy with markets in the free world.

Mr. President, the approach I have suggested to the refugee problem in Hong Kong does not, of course, rule out the resettlement of refugees to other areas of the world. But considering the number of people involved, and other factors inherent in the potential movement of any large group of people, migration offers a very limited potential toward a solution. Nevertheless, whenever feasible, resettlement opportunities must be encouraged and pursued, for this will lessen, somewhat, the burden in Hong Kong. Certainly, President Kennedy's Chinese parolee program is assisting in this direction. So, too, are the offers of

other countries. But this action is a temporary and limited expedient. Our Chinese parolee program is only a piecemeal approach to the situation. What we really need in the long run is an intelligent reform of our basic immigration law. Such action on the part of Congress would strike a greater blow for freedom, and would serve as a far more appropriate example for other nations to follow than does a temporary expedient.

As the Members of the Senate know, Mr. President, S. 3043, which I introduced with the cosponsorship of 25 of my colleagues, would accomplish the objective of which I speak. This bill would remove the discriminatory clauses in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, thereby raising the Chinese quota. It would also place on our statute books a permanent provision for the admission to this country of up to 50,000 refugees annually, from all parts of the world. This bill, Mr. President, would bring our present immigration concepts and practices more closely into line with our traditions and ideals, and add substantially to our good will throughout the world.

Mr. President, I have a deep and abiding conviction that America's actions for Chinese refugees will be sufficient and appropriate, and commensurate with the political realities of the international arena. There has been some expression of concern that we have not done enough in Hong Kong, and that our position in the world has been damaged by recent happenings in the crown colony. But let us put some facts into focus. Let us set the record straight—and I emphasize this point, Mr. President. The most badly damaged reputation as a consequence of the events in Hong Kong is that of the Government of Red China. The defeat is one suffered by the Communist leadership of that country. The failure is theirs. The depression and panic displayed by China's refugees is a devastating commentary on the regime of Mao Tse-tung.

Our response to the needs of Chinese refugees is being observed by a waiting world. They want to see if we practice what we preach. But this waiting world must also be made keenly aware of the reasons for the flight of Chinese refugees: An oppressive and intolerable political, economic, and social system. Too often in the past our genuine humanitarian concern for refugees from communism has beclouded this reality, and thus blunted the persuasive ideological force of our compassion.

But today, I trust that our informational facilities at home and abroad are giving maximum attention to the agony of mainland China and the failure of the Communist regime to provide even a tolerable life for its people. This, coupled with positive efforts by the free nations to give effective asylum to Chinese refugees, unquestionably will further the cause of freedom in Asia throughout the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the role of the U.S. Government in the use of the coming communications satellite system will be great. Indeed, in all likelihood the U.S. Government will be the largest user by overwhelming odds. In addition to being the largest user of the satellite communications system, the Government will have a leading role in its operation.

I invite attention to the minority views on page 51 of the committee report:

Even if a decision were made to place ownership and control of this country's satellite communications system in a private monopoly, the Government would necessarily continue to have its leading role. The Government would be required to:

1. Furnish launch vehicles.
2. Launch the satellites and provide launch crew and associated services.
3. Consult with the private corporation regarding technical specifications for satellites and ground stations and in determining the number and location of such facilities.
4. Coordinate continuing governmental research and development with the activities of the private corporation.
5. Insure that the satellite system established is technically compatible with existing facilities with which it will interconnect.
6. Insure that present and future access to the system on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis is made available to all authorized communications carriers.
7. Preserve competition in the field of supplying goods and services to the corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 3 minutes allotted to the Senator from Tennessee have expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Chair. Continuing to read from the minority views:

8. Supervise any change in the internal structure of the private corporation.
9. Insure that opportunities are provided for foreign participation in the system.
10. Insure that the corporation provides communication services to areas of the world where such services may be uneconomical, if it is determined that providing such services would be in the national interest.

11. Last, but by no means least, the Government would have to regulate the rate-making process.

So, Mr. President, the establishment of a satellite communications system, and the manner in which it is established, is of vital importance to the U.S. Government and to the taxpayers of the United States. The Government will be its largest user. The Government, under the terms of the bill, if passed, would establish not free enterprise but a pri-

vate monopoly. Since the Government would be the largest user, it would become the largest contributor to the financial rewards of a private monopoly. The Government would still remain an essential cooperator with that private monopoly and continue to contribute vastly, both in technology and in means, to its success.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I commend my colleague [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and others who have already expressed their views on this very important subject. I heard my colleague say something about monopoly. Is it not true that the proposed bill would carve out from the antitrust laws an exception and allow companies to join a consortium, a joint enterprise private corporation, which could not be done under the antitrust laws without the proposed immunity being granted?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. Some people call the proposal free enterprise. By what stretch of the imagination could the proposed corporation be called free enterprise? The measure would create a monopoly to which the Government would be the heaviest contributor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I cannot recall any time in the history of our Nation in which the Government has carved out an exception in the antitrust laws for the purpose of itself creating a monopoly. I had always thought that the purpose of the Government was to foster free and competitive enterprise and to prevent monopolies from growing up. I wish to ask the Senator if in the present case we find the Government itself—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes.

Without objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that before the conclusion of the business of the Senate on Friday last a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into by means of which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is now entitled to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If other Senators desire to make speeches, I shall be glad to yield to them for that purpose

at this time. I do not wish to monopolize the floor. If there are no other Senators who wish to speak, I will proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator will yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. This is a tremendously important subject. It is not well understood by all Members of the Senate or by the public. We have had a very hard time getting the demerits of the proposal understood by the people generally.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator for that purpose, without my losing the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 93 Leg.]

Anderson	Hayden	Pastore
Bartlett	Holland	Pell
Beall	Hruska	Randolph
Bennett	Jackson	Scott
Bible	Johnston	Smathers
Boggs	Jordan	Smith, Maine
Burdick	Keating	Sparkman
Bush	Kefauver	Symington
Cannon	Kuchel	Talmadge
Carlson	Long, La.	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Mansfield	Tower
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Miller	Yarborough
Ellender	Moss	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mundt	
Hart	Neuberger	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to call upon the absent Senators and request their attendance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. KERR, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield such time to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WE ARE TRYING TO PROTECT THE GOLDEN EAGLE—WHY NOT PROTECT GOLD ITSELF?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I was intrigued with the opening sentence on page 41 of the golden learn-about book devoted to Alaska which states:

When people think of mining in Alaska the first thing that comes to mind is gold.

Golden learn-about books are designed primarily for the younger reader. Their pages contain simple facts of history, past and present. I regret to report that the statement to which I have just referred is fast becoming past history.

Gold mining in Alaska, as elsewhere in the Union, is on the decline. Indeed, it is nearly extinct, and unless Treasury Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs Roosa remove their blinders, I fear that gold mining in Alaska and in all other States will soon be placed in a museum next to the dodo bird, the passenger pigeon, and the great auk. Is the golden eagle, which some of us are trying to protect by legislation now before the Congress, to join them in the ornithological graveyard?

Sometimes it would seem that the Treasury Department is giving the gold mining industry what in some portions of our society is termed "the bird."

We can sometimes learn from children.

The golden book tells its readers that "Gold has been Alaska's most important metal." The golden book, most appropriately, reports that Alaska also is a storehouse of other minerals, including coal, copper, platinum, asbestos, zinc, tungsten, and cobalt.

Today, however, our attention, of necessity, turns to gold and to ways and means by which domestic gold production can be encouraged rather than discouraged.

I was discouraged, Mr. President, by the testimony of Mr. Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, when he appeared before the Senate Interior and Insular

Affairs Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels earlier this month. Under Secretary Roosa, speaking for his boss, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, authoritatively discussed the matter of balance of payments and described the continuing efforts of our Government to correct the existing imbalance. Such efforts are, of course, necessary and needed. The Under Secretary, the Secretary, and all Americans must work to correct this deficiency.

But meanwhile, back at the gold mine, time is running out. A great national industry needs help. When Mr. Roosa says "The monetary system of the entire free world is hinged to the interconvertibility which we maintain between gold and dollars at that price. Any form of subsidy to American gold production would impair that relationship," he confuses the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 44 which was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and cosponsored by a number of other Senators.

The workable, simple solution proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 44, a subsidy for newly mined domestic gold, can take effect immediately.

I hate to labor this really simple matter but apparently we must if the gold mining industry is to survive and continue to offer a market for labor.

When Mr. Roosa told the committee members that talk of a subsidy created alarm and apprehension in financial circles I suggested that the employees of the Treasury Department were like the leaves of the quaking aspen tree which tremble and quiver even when there is no breeze.

I suggested to the Under Secretary that he did appear to be quaking about an imagined future calamity. He accepted the analogy, and added, "I feel that anything that impairs or raises a question concerning gold is a matter of vital importance. I quake whenever I hear it."

In the world of music a fantasia is described as "a composition in which the author's fancy roves unrestricted by set form." It is further described as "an instrumental composition characterized by freedom of fancy unrestricted by set form" and as "a potpourri of familiar airs." Such seemed the case June 8.

I shall be commenting in more detail about that session. If the Department of the Treasury wishes to replay its "potpourri of familiar airs" let it do so in the privacy of its own musical salon, not before a Senate committee honestly intent on finding a cure for the ills of the gold mining industry.

Meanwhile, unless the Treasury Department comes up with something more than wholly negative responses to every suggestion for keeping our gold mining industry in production it will soon be extinct in the United States though flourishing elsewhere.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] for such time as he re-

quires without prejudice to any of my rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A RETURN TO FUNDAMENTALS IN OUR LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in 1823 the United States, a fledgling Nation only 36 years old, with a population of 10 million people, faced a major challenge with courage and determination.

It was in that year that our fifth President, in his message to Congress, bluntly told the powers of Europe to keep hands off America—all of it.

Said James Monroe:

The American continents are not to be considered subjects for future colonization by any European power.

Any attempt of a European power to intervene in the affairs of American states for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, would be considered as the manifestation of an unfriendly act toward the United States.

Europe's kings and chancellors were astounded. Prince Metternich of Austria said that President Monroe's action was "a new revolt—no less dangerous than" the American Revolution.

But by and large, the United States made its decision stick. The European powers reluctantly accepted the hemispheric barrier raised against them and Latin America's new nations retained their shaky freedom.

President Monroe's words were directed to Czar Alexander I, who sought to spread Russian territorial claims along the western coast of North America. Monroe feared this might mean Russian colonization of that area.

Almost one and a half centuries later, another Russian—Khrushchev—had words to say about the doctrine.

In July of 1960 Khrushchev spoke as follows:

We consider that the Monroe Doctrine has outlived its time, has outlived itself, has died, so to say, a natural death. Now the remains of this doctrine should best be buried as every dead body is so that it does not poison the air by its decay.

The lesson was not lost on Khrushchev that the philosophy of the Monroe Doctrine is still the keystone of inter-American mutual security.

The State Department was quick to respond to Khrushchev's challenge. On July 14, 1960, it said:

The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823. . . . Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American states is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of American States.

In April 1961, President Kennedy declared:

Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction, if the nations of the hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it

clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation.

The President was simply stating the fact that the United States can exercise the inherent right of self-defense and the implications were that any Communist takeover in any of the Western Hemisphere countries involves, in a matter of degree, this Nation's national security.

In fact, both President Kennedy and his predecessor, President Eisenhower, went even further. Speaking of the Khrushchev "pledge" of support to Castro, and his "figurative" threat to use Soviet rockets to keep Cuba Communist, President Eisenhower said in July 1960:

I affirm in the most emphatic terms that the United States will not be deterred from its responsibilities by the threat Mr. Khrushchev is making. Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

President Kennedy was explicit when he said last April 20:

Cuba must not be abandoned to the Communists. And we do not intend to abandon it either.

The fact is that the United States through countless resolutions, treaties, and declarations starting with the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 down through the pledges at Punta del Este in 1962 is unequivocally pledged to the maintenance of freedom and the doctrine of independence and self-determination for our neighbors in this hemisphere.

However, in the wake of Lenin's contribution to 20th century political activity—overthrow of legitimate governments by infiltration and subversion—the enlightened inter-American policy of nonintervention and self-determination must be interpreted prudently.

For it is entirely conceivable that a liberal but unrealistic application of this policy could guarantee that a handful of tightly disciplined, well-coordinated Communists—working behind a shield of constitutionality within their own country—would be successful in seizing a legitimate, democratic Latin American government.

By so doing those purists who demanded letter by letter interpretation of nonintervention, without recourse to outside events, would frustrate the very spirit of the policy, which is to allow freedom to flourish.

President Roberto F. Chiari, of Panama, expressed it very succinctly recently on his visit to Washington when he spoke before the Council of the Organization of American States. He cautioned the nations of the hemisphere against "drifting toward a new formula of eyes shut and hands off" in observing the principles of self-determination and nonintervention.

Referring to Cuba, President Chiari said:

This new formula would seem to be leading, and we have already seen examples of this, toward an almost complete indifference to the fate of brother peoples who, within their own boundaries, are deprived by force

of all chance for self-determination, and for whom the principle of nonintervention, carried to its most extreme interpretation, becomes a universal condemnation to live forever subject to the oppression that incurably afflicts them.

He added that the old principles should be reviewed so that they would not close the door to possible collective measures intended to assure all the peoples of the Americas, within their own boundaries, of their freedom, their right to control their own destiny, and their right to reestablish, when they have been deprived of it by force, the rule of representative democracy, which is the essence of the American regional system.

Our Nation has now made another fundamental pledge to Latin America through the Alliance for Progress—the most sweeping and practical joint effort ever proposed for the mutual benefit of the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Both pledges, one emphasizing military, the other economics, complement each other and promote the cause of unity and freedom in the Western Hemisphere. The first preserves the integrity of the inter-American system and its pledge to combat Communist intrusion while the second makes it possible for the hemisphere to develop its vast economic and cultural potential.

I believe our plan to push forward with the Alliance for Progress is eminently correct.

The Alianza is revolutionary in concept and is oriented toward people who will no longer be denied a way of life based on decency and respect for the individual.

Under the direction of Ted Moscoso, who, I believe, possesses that balance of pragmatism and vision necessary to make it a success, the Alliance for Progress can prove to be the world's most successful venture in self-help.

But we must always keep in mind that Latin America's problems are enormous and they differ widely from one country to another.

Some problems—the question of land distribution for instance—are ancient. They were old under the native Aztecs and Incas even before the first Spaniards set foot in America, and in some respects they worsened during three centuries of ruthless empire-building by the colorful Spanish conquistadors.

Other problems, for example the great disparity in the distribution of earthly goods among the people and the lack of a stable middle class in Latin American countries, took root centuries ago in the industrial age and still cling on doggedly—to the grief of 200 million people.

These problems are complex, deep-seated, widespread, and defiant of quick or easy solution. Those who see the Alliance for Progress as a patented "ready-to-work-in-30-seconds" headache cure can look elsewhere for a miracle drug. It will not cure the patient in Latin America overnight or in a week—or even in a year. He needs plenty of attention, considerable surgery, a long period of convalescence and, most importantly, the firm will to help himself get better.

This has been my stated view since the Alliance was first announced and I still hold to it.

It is significant that the Alliance for Progress has been recognized by all grades of students of Latin American affairs as the best way yet suggested to bring about the vast changes which Latin America needs.

None have been quicker to see the Alliance's great potential than its most determined enemies—the Communists and their allies of the moment, paradoxically Latin America's extreme right wing.

The Reds call the Alliance "a new form of U.S. imperialism." But they actually see it as an antidote to much of Latin America's poverty, disease, and general chaos, which they do not want corrected.

Meanwhile, those on the extreme right fear that the changes which the Alliance promises will end their selfish and entrenched feudal position, and they fight it bitterly, even to the extent of joining with the Communists in a temporary "marriage of convenience."

At this point, those who lead the Alliance can be certain of only two things: First they have only—and barely—started; the major job still lies ahead; and second, if the Alliance fails, freedom and individual rights in the entire Western Hemisphere will have suffered a tragic setback.

Therefore, the task falls to all of us—those in government, those in business, those who classify themselves as private citizens—to join forces in making it succeed.

Already the Alliance has come in for serious criticism from responsible sources in Latin America. At the recent Conference of the Inter-American Development Bank at Buenos Aires, the Colombian Finance Minister, Jorge Mejia Palacio, said the Alliance is a noble plan but "has not been able to achieve its rhythm."

Palacio contends that this failure has led to continuation of "the impoverishment of the people, deepening the economic differences between classes, precipitation of crises, devaluations, unemployment, as we have been able to see in various nations in these months."

Palacio complained that though Colombia—which is a demonstrated good and true friend of the United States—has received substantial aid and credits from the Alliance, actually the losses suffered in the country because of a drop in coffee prices within the last several months is two or three times greater than Alliance assistance, and the country has become poorer rather than improved despite the Alliance. As Alice discovered in Wonderland, sometimes you have to run twice as fast just to stay even.

The Bolivian Minister of Agricultural Affairs charged at the same Conference that the United States has been dragging its feet with the most needy Latin American nations. He asked whether the Alliance is "fact or fiction."

In fairness, we must remember that the United States has by no means ignored the plight of Bolivia. In the last 3 years we have provided that country with \$68.7 million in loans and grants.

But the point of this is that while both Bolivia and Colombia are well disposed toward our Nation, and have already received considerable assistance, the Alliance has not yet demonstrated in those countries or elsewhere the dynamic thrust it needs to catch hold in Latin America.

I believe that the lack of success to date can be ascribed to several reasons:

First, the difficulty of taking a bold new venture and trying to make it work through the operation of an old-fashioned bureaucracy which is just not geared to deal with such things.

Secondly, a lack of realism in the beginning phase of the Alliance by both our administrators as well as the leaders of the Latin nations involved.

In this area, I believe we failed to get across the idea at the outset that this program was not a giant giveaway nor was it intended to prop and bolster the entrenched greed, too often found with the status quo.

It needed to be made unmistakably clear that the Alliance is just what it says—an alliance; an alliance of their people and ours, their governments and ours, and an alliance of these peoples and these governments in a venture to achieve progress—progress toward desirable goals as distinguished from mere activity which could result in upheaval and civil war which are themselves sometimes mistakenly called progress.

Activity is not necessarily synonymous with progress. But action properly channeled and directed is progress within the meaning of the term "Alliance for Progress."

So we needed to make it absolutely certain that we had to have action and progress in the area of land reform, tax reforms, election reforms, among others, all calculated to bring about a betterment of the conditions of the peoples of Latin America.

I think that within the last few months much of the misconception with respect to the real purposes of the Alliance for Progress has been eliminated. I believe that it has now become rather clear to everyone that this is not a program of something for nothing, and it is my impression that the program has now in recent weeks, for the first time, begun to live up to some of its high expectations.

However, there are still a number of basic decisions which have to be made in proceeding with the Alliance for Progress.

They are difficult and delicate in the extreme. The principle decision which in every instance has to be made is exactly who is it we wish to help?

Surely, we do not wish to help a nation that is already committed to goals and systems inimical to our way of life.

Surely, we do not wish to give aid and comfort to peoples, or governments, or nations, who are our enemies in fact if not in form.

If I may, I should like to suggest some factors to be considered on this question of who is to be helped, by saying I do not think it is uttering a commonplace or a disloyalty to say that first of all we should help our friends—those who show they share at least some goals with us;

those who have demonstrated that they are working toward preserving and expanding a free society for their people.

Further, I think we should always be willing to help those who have demonstrated they have some understanding of the mutuality and duality of the terms "allies" and "alliance."

In determining which countries should be helped there will have to be 19 individual judgments made, for in truth each Latin American nation is totally separate and distinct from its neighbors; each one has its individual characteristics and separate and unusual economic and political problems. None of them fits the same exact pattern. Each of them is at a different stage of economic and political development. Some are moving rapidly in the right direction of political development. Others are moving slowly, and some even appear to have moved backward.

In considering what help, if any, we can give to what nations in Latin America, I would like to set out some guidelines which I think could judiciously be followed.

First, it is easy enough to say we should give suitable help to Latin American countries which are openly and effectively democratic. Conversely, of course, we should not help governments which openly disavow the course which leads toward strengthening democracy and individual freedom. But in many Latin American nations we are confronted with a confused middle ground of conflicting forces at work; what do we do then?

In such situations, I think we have to look at which way a nation is moving. Is it moving away from its dark past and into the light of stability and toward the creation of institutions of freedom, which in time mean progress and democracy for its people?

In this nebulous area, I would suggest there are two important factors to always consider in determining whether a country should be helped or not.

The first is the direction in which the country is aimed by its leadership, and the second is its movement.

If a country is generally headed in the right direction, that is, toward democracy, even though possibly not on the exact course which we would prescribe, but nevertheless headed generally toward the target of free institutions, then we can consider they have met the first factor needed for their qualification for assistance.

The second factor is their movement in the direction in which they are headed. One again, the country may not be moving as rapidly nor as strongly as we would like, but if it is moving, even though painfully slow, then I believe this should be the second factor in determining whether or not we should help.

In each instance it is evident that if the country is headed in the right direction and is making some movement in the right direction, with our cooperation, advice, and assistance, the movement can be speeded and the direction can be more specifically defined. This would then qualify the country as making progress

in the meaning of the term "Alliance for Progress."

Some additional factors which I believe should serve as guidelines in deciding whom we should help would be: Does there exist in the country under consideration institutions which, when developed to the fullest, will result in a vigorous democracy? Are the leaders of the country under consideration conscientiously directing their nation's energies toward the creation of these institutions?

These institutions include personal liberty for the individual, a stability of government, a broadening access to education, a system of minimum standards of public health and welfare, the opportunity for a laborer to earn a living wage, and for the farmer to gain an investment from the land he tills, and a chance for a businessman to acquire and keep in his own name property and money without fear of confiscation, a developing body of laws, and a growing respect for those laws on the part of officials and the individual citizens of the country.

These minimum standards would be a means of meeting people's needs without driving them to the power elite of the right or the left.

These may seem modest goals to the people of the United States, who now wear their democracy easily and who live under one of the oldest democratic governments in the world.

But, as Columnist Edgar Ansel Mower pointed out recently, "Democracy is not an article of export. It cannot be given or imposed. It must be learned."

To many people in Latin America the words "democracy" and "freedom" were what their strong-man ruler harangued them with, as he marched dissenters off to prison or the execution wall.

Because there is such enormous disparity—economic, social and political—among Latin American countries, the judgments of who shall be aided and what we should do above and beyond our aid programs to produce, foster, and encourage the spread of democracy in these countries should be, and has to be, left to the experts.

These experts, those within the State Department, those leaders of the Alliance for Progress, representatives of the other U.S. Government agencies who rightfully have a concern in the problem, and importantly, those men and women who have represented us and their business concerns in Latin America for many years and who have acquired a rich storehouse of knowledge about the country and its people in which they have lived; all these people working together should be prepared to make judgments on a country-by-country basis as to what we should do.

Most Latin American nations are still clambering through different stages of political transition. The tide of democracy, while being buffeted rather severely from time to time, is nevertheless running strong in Latin America, and with the help of a nation like ours, democracy can win. But it would not rise full blown from the ground after a handful of seeds are planted and a few sprinkling

cans of water are passed over them. Democracy is a flower, slow to bloom, and a fragile one for a while—and certainly one that needs attention and cultivation to become strong and permanent.

Let us take these general principles and apply them in the case of Argentina, which today is thrashing about in a crisis that puts its peoples and institutions to a severe test and at the same time thrusts the horns of a dilemma toward the administrator of the Alliance for Progress.

Argentina today, while being one of the more advanced nations from the standpoint of education, literacy, economic development, and political responsibility, nevertheless has in recent weeks deposed its President, sent the Congress home, and established, according to our standards at least, a form of military dictatorship. The nation faces a perilous and difficult future.

Under the Alliance for Progress the United States faces the difficult decision of determining to what extent do we now help Argentina.

One distinguished observer of the Latin American scene might help provide some guidance for us.

He is Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, the respected publisher of *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires, one of Latin America's great newspapers. His credentials as a staunch friend of the United States, an anti-Communist and a fighter for democracy are well recognized.

During the reign of Juan Peron, Dr. Gainza Paz fought the Argentine dictator to the point where Peron seized his newspaper and turned it into a rabble-rousing mouthpiece for the Peronista party. Two years ago I sat with Dr. Gainza Paz in his office in Buenos Aires. He showed me the door which Peron's storm trooper battered open when they marched in to arrest him and to muzzle *La Prensa*.

The publisher went into exile, and returned to his beloved land and his newspaper years later, after Peron had been overthrown.

A short time ago, Dr. Gainza Paz, who is visiting in the United States, said that the military of his nation did right in overthrowing President Frondizi recently because his continuance in office would very likely have led to a new Peronista dictatorship for Argentina. "The military," said Gainza Paz, "acted to preserve Argentina's freedom."

On the surface, these are puzzling statements, but let us examine them.

The evils of Peron's dictatorship constantly plagued Frondizi as President. While in Argentina, I talked to many laborers, union leaders, white-collar workers and people from all walks of life, who grumbled openly at what they said were economic hardships which they suffered under Frondizi's democratic government. They openly stated that life for them was better under Peron.

This story was a bitter commentary, for it was clear to those who thought about it that Peron cultivated the workers by twisting the economy of his country topsy-turvy, granting massive pay

raises which far outstripped productivity to the point that it was well known the nation was bankrupt long before Peron was overthrown and Dr. Frondizi came in.

It is interesting to remember how Peron was overthrown. It was the military who did it. They overthrew Peron in 1955 and named a military man, General Aramburo, as interim leader. It was he who created conditions of stability and, subsequently, voluntarily stepped aside when free elections were set and made it possible for a freely elected President, Dr. Frondizi, to assume the office of the Presidency in 1958.

Dr. Frondizi was, and is, a brilliant and capable man. He perceived that which needed to be done, and in pursuing that goal he was compelled to establish austerity programs.

No one likes austerity, in Argentina or anywhere else, so far as I have been able to discover, and so Dr. Frondizi's administration became a series of economic and political crises. For awhile it appeared the able doctor would survive them all, but when he removed the ban on the political activities of the Peronistas, they quickly made common cause with the Communists, and in the last election won a majority of the legislative seats.

Everybody's hindsight is 20-20, and in retrospect a mistake was made when Dr. Frondizi allowed Peronista candidates, whose party had long been outlawed, to run for offices in the March 18 congressional and provincial elections.

Despite the fact that they joined up with the Communists and, in effect, voted to destroy their democratic right of franchise by voting for a return to dictatorship, they won surprising victories in 10 provinces and gained 35 percent of the popular vote. Under Argentine law, the party which wins the largest percentage of the popular vote is automatically given 66 percent of the representation in the legislature. To the leaders of the military this seemed a sufficient threat of the possibility of a return to power of Peron or one of his appointees, so they felt compelled to act: First, to order the provincial elections nullified and then ultimately to force out Dr. Frondizi. The former Vice President, Jose Maria Guido, now heads an uneasy and unhappy Argentine Government.

This is a critical time for Argentina, and what the United States does or does not do, in dealings with that country in the immediate future will have great effect. Notwithstanding the intervention of the military, Argentina still retains a framework of constitutional government. On the surface, it is headed by a president, not by a military junta.

However, the Argentine political situation has become kaleidoscopic. Like New England weather, the reports about the situation are outdated seemingly every time the clock strikes. President Guido first issued a decree outlawing Argentine elections for the past year and thus nullified the provincial and congressional elections of early March, which gave the Peronistas victory.

President Guido has suspended political parties and sent the Congress into a long recess for the announced purpose

of purging Peronists from the political life of Argentina. For the next year he will rule by decree.

To those who love and support democracy—in Argentina, in Latin America, and here at home—this action of President Guido appears to be very strong medicine. It would be easy to oversimplify the case and write Argentina off on the one hand, or close our eyes to the setback of democracy and proceed as before, on the other.

Frankly, I do not think we can do either. We cannot oversimplify; it is not a simple problem that lends itself to quick and simple solutions.

There are two great forces at work in Argentina: The pro and antidemocratic groups. The antidemocrats are a motley lot. It might raise the eyebrows of some to take a look at them—Peronistas, Communists, Castroites, the strong-arm totalitarian faction of the military—all cynically working together for one purpose, to crush free and representative government in Argentina and to establish their own brand of dictatorship.

On the other side are the proponents of democracy, and there is great dissimilarity even among them. There are some workers, a great many of the middle class, apparently a majority of the military leaders, and the intellectual traditional supporters of democracy.

Not all of them see democracy in the same light. There are the realists and the dreamy theorists, the practical and the ham-handed, the patient ones and those who still want the millennium overnight.

However, most of these understand the significance of the antidemocratic heritage of Peron, the depths to which Peronism has penetrated into the minds of the people and the enormous task which faces those leaders who want to bring the Argentine people back to the hard road of day-to-day democracy.

Argentine politics, like those of any other country, involve a series of conflicting forces. The groups opposing democracy are at the moment united, for their only immediate goal is to destroy democracy. Those who seek democracy, on the other hand, are, by the very nature of the system they espouse, diverse in their interests and proposed methods; and so they often work at cross purposes with one another.

The Argentine Congress is basically democratic and as is usually the case distrustful and fearful of the military. However, overall it is clear that the pressures to continue constitutional government still run strong in Argentina.

A key question in Argentina is how far the military will go in forcing its will on the people. Or, in other words, will the military protect or remove those institutions which strengthen democracy in Argentine political life?

At best, the greatest stress will be put on the democratic system as Argentina tries to throw off a long-festering infection, regain its stability, and once again begin to move in the general direction of democracy and freedom.

The government which emerges may be a transitional one which does not rep-

resent fully the democracy we would wish for the Argentine people. But because it is a transitional government that needs help and guidance, I think we should give careful thought to co-operating with it and giving what help must be suitable, all of the time seeking to prod and guide it in the direction of a well-established democracy.

It is very likely that the military will have a strong role in such a transitional government. They now have a strong position in the present government. But the fact that the military may exert influence in such a government should not be automatically taken to mean the government is authoritarian or that Argentina is hopelessly lost.

We should remember that it was a military provisional government of General Aramburo which ousted Peron's dictatorship and gave to Argentina a democratic government headed by Dr. Frondizi.

I do not think we should forget the history of Argentina, or of other Latin American governments.

Argentina is still struggling to overcome its heritage of economic chaos and political instability willed to it by Peron. It has taken, in recent years, many steps forward, although recently some few backward. But over the last decade its overall movement and direction have been toward improving democracy; and of course it still has a long way to go. Breathing time is needed now for stability, for heads to clear, and for the development of programs which will pick up the baton of democracy and will move it forward again.

In this manner, we can be helpful through our programs, through the Alliance for Progress but I repeat that we must always keep on the pressure to move Argentina, or any country in a similar situation, toward the direction of democratic institutions. Direction is the important element of consideration.

The alternative to assisting a struggling, democratic-tending government is to do nothing and, surely, if we should follow that course, we thereby would give aid and comfort to Argentina's other organized forces—the out-and-out antidemocrats, who do not want free representative government at all, but who, on the contrary, want monolithic Communist dictatorship.

If democracy must struggle through the churning currents of present Argentine history, without help and without guidance, how much greater will be her struggle as she seeks to reach solid ground in countries where democracy has at best been dimly known.

The future political course for many Latin American nations will not be a smooth super highway affair. It will of necessity be a zigzag road—sometimes tortuous and bumpy, at other times, free-flowing and inviting rapid progress; but always capable of carrying its people onto some dark detour of repression and dictatorship if ever the will to advance is lost and if the momentum of its direction is lost.

Gov. Carlos Lacerda, of Guanabara State, in Brazil, who as publisher of an influential newspaper fought fiercely against the Brazilian dictatorship of

Getulio Vargas, said recently of his nation:

Our greatest difficulty, as with Argentina and so many others, lies in the fact that we are in the experimental stage, always difficult at best, of transforming a dictatorship into a democracy without going through a period of adaptation or sound appraisal. It could be said that for some years we have been trying to reclaim a swamp with mud, and build on it a new house from the materials of the old one which collapsed.

Those who are watching from abroad make the mistake of disregarding the will of the people and paying more attention to the words of the demagogues, the adventurers, the cowards and the corrupt who at times speak in the name of the popular masses without the authority to do so.

Those who listen only to these so-called spokesmen gather the impression that the majority of the people are identified with Fidel Castro and are opposed to an alliance with the United States and with the sister nations of the continent.

In a dozen Latin American countries the elected leaders have no more than a fingertip hold on governments supposed to be heading toward democracy. These leaders are under strong pressure from the extreme left—from the Communists—and from the extreme right. One time it is from labor; another time, the military; sometimes, the intellectuals; oftentimes, the press, the church, and other groups. They are forced into a fantastic series of political compromises which stretch out constitutional government like a landlady's beef stew on Saturday night.

But the important thing is that these governments are still working in some rough equation of free and representative leadership and government. It is just because there is still the desire among enough responsible men to keep these governments headed toward democracy that there is reason for us to help and to cooperate with them. Thus, wherever we find governments run by responsible, representative leadership dedicated to the principles we espouse, and headed in the right direction, and moving slowly, although sometimes haltingly, yet aimed the right way, we should extend our help.

Another case where we must proceed realistically is that of the Dominican Republic. There, the overthrow of a longtime dictator has given the people a chance for a free and better life. A democratic government has been formed. It is free, favorable to the United States, and strongly anti-Communist.

The Dominican Republic is passing through an economic crisis at the present time. We have given help; and we must continue to do so, so that conditions of stability and confidence can be firmly established. With stability and with the flourishing of democratic institutions comes confidence; capital then stops its flight; private investment is then encouraged to come in, and private investment, we must remember, is an integral part of the total program.

Ted Moscoso said recently that there is not enough money in government treasuries of the world to sustain the Latin American nations. So it is imperative that private capital be induced to come in and take part in the develop-

ing economies, through joint ventures with local citizens, and with confidence that they will be appreciated and will be protected from confiscation.

The Dominican Republic can be, and I am sure will be, a very bright star in the constellation of the Caribbean if we realistically help now, through increased sugar quotas, loans, and stepped-up programs of private capital investment, through guarantees on the part of its government against confiscation.

Colombia and Peru are staunch friends; and they have made remarkable strides in the right direction, and are still moving in the right direction. Indeed they are entitled to our special help and assistance.

Having talked of those who deserve our assistance and cooperation, let us speak of those who did not. In brief, we should refuse help to any country whose leaders persistently deny basic personal liberties to the people or who maintain rule by tyranny or terror.

We must be inflexible in our opposition to communism and to corruption. We cannot in the slightest degree compromise these twin evils.

U.S. foreign-aid funds have no place in a country where they are used by the leaders to hold on to the reins of government for their own personal gains. For such cases, our rulings must be as final as umpire Bill Klem's; there can be no appeal while the conditions remain unchanged.

But in other cases we must be flexible. There are many Latin American countries which by our standards are far from the democratic ideal, but where institutions and conditions exist which can serve as the base for democracy, and the leaders of the government demonstrate a genuine desire to move in a democratic direction.

Earlier, I asked: What is the progress which the Alliance promises?

Certainly, it is to offer Latin Americans an opportunity to help themselves—an opportunity to develop the riches of Latin America's lands, its mines, forests, rivers, and to give its people the chance to live a better life than that which they have known.

But if the goal is material progress alone, then we have helped build a castle of sand, and the tides of history will not leave it standing for long.

The Alliance can, in union with the people of Latin America, foster a hemispheric frame of mind akin to the spirit of those who created a new world in North America.

The Alliance should be dedicated to fostering a sense of dignity and worth of the individual, a desire for personal liberty and freedom, a sense of civic responsibility, a will to cooperate for the common good, and a belief in the omnipotence of the Almighty.

Finally, there is the question of how the Alliance can best be made to work.

May I suggest that the following steps be carried out:

First. The welding together of our economic programs in Latin America with our political goals.

Second. The instituting of a policy of realism in our dealings with Latin America.

Third. The naming of an Under Secretary for Latin American Affairs, reporting directly to the President, who would combine and coordinate the various efforts of our State Department, Agency for International Development, Peace Corps, Defense Department, and the host of other Government agencies now concerned in some fashion or other with activities in Latin America.

Fourth. Recognition of a free Cuban Government in exile by the United States.

Let me group the first and second points together, since in a practical manner they would be treated as one.

In the next fiscal year, the U.S. Government will spend well over \$1 billion in Latin America. During the next 10 years that figure might reach \$15 billion.

These aid programs, if they are effectively executed will be mutually helpful to the United States and the Latin American Republics receiving our aid.

But it is foolish, Mr. President, to think that we can spend billions of dollars in a practical effort to help Latin Americans help themselves and still keep our economic programs antiseptically quarantined from our political goals.

It is foolish to do it even if we could. For surely, we are motivated to help for two reasons: First, to help them; and second, to help ourselves.

If we strengthen the sagging economy of a depressed coffee-growing province by helping to set up a new industry there, we have also helped to frustrate the Communist appeal to the poverty-stricken workers. To deny the relation between aid money and political aims is to live in a world of illusion.

Which leads to my second point: Using the yardstick of realism in our dealings with the people and governments of Latin America.

The Latin, for all of his mystical qualities, is in fact a hardheaded realist. The millions of impoverished people in northeast Brazil who must go out every morning of the year to hunt or fish or scrape the ground for their food for that day are not idle dreamers building castles in Spain. They are human beings battling nature to keep alive.

The problems of Latin Americans are raw and harsh and tough.

They will not be solved by dreamers and no one knows this more than the Latins themselves.

I think that I am correct in saying that the Alliance for Progress—and, in fact, all of our dealings with Latin America—are caught up in the battle between romance versus realism. I do not think we ever solved any of our problems by asking the romanticists to work out a solution for them. I am sure that in Latin America, of all places, it is economic and political realism which is needed—on the part of those who apply for assistance as well as those who give it.

For instance, we can no longer continue to confuse our friends by granting sweeping aid to our admitted enemies or our near enemies, or those who so mildly approve any of our stands that their

voice never rises above a whisper in speaking well of the United States.

We cannot pass out billions of foreign aid dollars to the nations of Latin America, and make no distinction between those countries which support our fight against the extension of communism anywhere in the world, on the one hand, and those who watch from a safe vantage point of indifference from the other.

We surely must put some checkrein on foreign aid to a country where opportunistic politicians seize American property and offer a token payment in return. Again it is a case of applying realism versus romanticism.

Countries which have caused the flight of American private capital have no right to expect the U.S. Government subsidies to fill that vacuum which has resulted. For, in reality, it is such private capital—from both Latin American and foreign nations—which is essential if the Alliance for Progress is to be a success.

We do not seek political intervention in any country. The domestic problems of any country are its own concern.

But we must continue to make it clear to the whole hemisphere that the grave economic problems which plague Latin America—and which the Alliance for Progress is so well fitted to combat—will never be overcome if international communism is allowed to continue its deadly penetration.

If a Latin American nation is not ready to join in effective political, economic, and social defense against Soviet onslaughts, then our economic aid to that country will ultimately be wasted away. Realism tells us that.

Turning to point three, just as we need to fuse the economic and political elements of our Latin American program, we need also to weld together the undertakings which are now being carried out by a proliferation of Government agencies. Just as we must coordinate the substance and implications of the policies themselves, we must coordinate the way in which they are administered.

For the scope of our activities in Latin America is vast, and the administrative system which carries them out is sprawling.

The programs include the Alliance for Progress, which is charged with the task of lifting Latin American economies by their bootstraps. The State Department has the massively complex and frustrating job of maintaining optimum diplomatic relations with 19 Latin American nations, all sharing a generally common heritage but each proudly and jealously guarding its political, social, and economic differences. To the U.S. Information Agency in Latin America is given the mission of projecting a clear and favorable image of our country.

The Defense Department has its military missions. Even the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, and the Agriculture Department have specialized functions given to them for various inter-American programs.

But from the U.S. position, who is coordinating our multibillion dollar projects in Latin America?

Who is defining our overall political goals within the Western Hemisphere

and relating them to the day-to-day execution of a bewildering series of Latin American-directed U.S. economic efforts?

The answer, I am afraid, is no one.

Some of our spending plans in Latin America have a completely justifiable political factor which we do wrong to ignore. Others of our projects—the Peace Corps is a good example—are properly outside the political realm and—I think almost everybody agrees—should remain that way.

But I suggest that we should have some person in centralized authority to make decisions as to when our economic and political efforts in Latin America should be united—and I think that is almost all the time—and when they should be kept far apart, and how to get the maximum benefits in every respect for our multiple efforts there.

For 14 years I have contended that Latin America was too often a second thought in U.S. planning. We took Latin America for granted, relinquished our traditional leadership in the hemisphere, and focused our stupendous efforts in economic assistance and development to other areas of the world. We have paid heavily for this overdrift of faulty thinking and blurred political perception.

U.S. policy, or lack of it, left our neighbors in the south confused, dismayed, and sometimes embittered. Now that such a dramatic turnabout has been made in our dealings with 200 million Latin Americans, let us make sure that we coordinate our efforts to their maximum efficiency—through the appointment of a full-powered director of inter-American activities.

There is one additional recommendation which I would like to make in regard to the Alliance for Progress: the recognition of a free Cuban government in exile.

Mr. President, you may find it strange that I include such a proposal in a discussion of the Alliance. But the relationship between our whole-hearted opposition of Castro's Communist dictatorship and our commitment to the goals of the Alliance is to me quite clear. In order for the Alliance to succeed in Latin America, attacks on its flank by Castro must be ended.

Castro cannot allow the Alliance to flourish. The contrast of a strong and prosperous democratic Latin America alongside a wretched Cuba would be intolerable to him. It was the same sort of contrast between democracy and totalitarianism that forced Khrushchev to wall off the misery of 20 million East Germans from a prosperous Western Europe.

Castro is a rallying point in the Western Hemisphere for the Communists, the extreme left wing, the totalitarians, the malcontents. He will, as he has thus far, fight the Alliance at every step.

In my opinion, the recognition of a free Cuban government in exile would be the most positive action we can take at this time to assure Castro's eventual defeat.

To recognize such a free government in exile would capture the hearts and

minds of 6 million Cubans now enslaved by the Cuban dictator. It would unite 250,000 Cuban refugees scattered all over Florida, New York, and other areas of the United States.

And it would serve notice to Latin America and the whole world that the United States has not and will not write off a Communist Cuba in an accepted or negotiable situation in this hemisphere.

At this time Castro is experiencing serious internal troubles—food shortages, intraparty fights, and growing resentment among the Cuban people.

We noted in the newspapers of yesterday that it was necessary for Castro to march tanks and troops into a little town to subdue the people, who were rebelling because of actions of the Communist dictatorship and the lack of food under the Communist system.

Now, at this critical time, we should exert the maximum pressure against Castro and keep it mounting to the breaking point.

What would recognition of a Cuban government in exile mean?

First of all, it would allow us to deal with the exile government openly and legally, as with any other free nation, and permit us to grant any necessary military aid the exiles might seek.

Secondly, the exile government could seek allies among Latin governments and those throughout the rest of the free world. It could be given membership in the Organization of American States.

Mr. President, there are many precedents for such a course of action.

We have always refused to recognize the Red Chinese government as the legitimate government of the Chinese people. We have held that this regime is illegal.

We have recognized the government of Chiang Kai-shek as the free Government of China.

Is not Castro's regime of government by imprisonment, the firing squad, the "stool pigeon," and the police state equally illegal, compared to that of the Red Chinese Communist government?

Castro will never allow the people whom he subjugates to express their will through free elections or even through ordinary freedom of expression.

We have recognized numerous other exile governments. During World War I we recognized the Czechoslovak and Polish Governments in exile. During World War II we recognized seven governments in exile from countries overrun by Hitler's Nazi hordes.

If we are to safeguard the Alliance in order to allow it to work at maximum efficiency and effectiveness, we must continue to take every possible positive step against Castro's Communist dictatorship.

For Castro continues to work at full throttle against the hemisphere's free nations. He has set up in Cuba scores of subversion schools, indoctrination centers, and propaganda classrooms. Their job is to "instruct"—or more simply, to brainwash—thousands of students, teachers, intellectuals, political leaders, Red revolutionaries and others from all over Latin America who attend these schools in Cuba.

Other thousands of Latin Americans learn the more direct tactics of guerilla warfare, street fighting, sabotage, and the like in Castro's classrooms.

The Communist plan is to send these indoctrinated people back to their homelands and set them to work systematically subverting their countries. They have scheduled Red takeovers in a dozen Latin American countries for 5, 10 or 20 years from now. The Reds are willing to wait, for they think at the moment that history is on their side. But in the meantime they are working to use every minute to their best advantage.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the able Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to have the Senator from Florida know that I agree with him on his proposal for recognition of a Cuban Government in exile. I assume the principal difficulty would be with respect to the determination of which group should be recognized. I do not say that in derogation of any group, but merely because I wish there could be such an agreement as would make more simple the recognition of such a government.

I agree with the Senator that the United States often has followed this practice in the past and that we should not continue to recognize this detestable Communist dictator whose hands are covered with the blood of his fellow citizens. It is a shame and a disgrace to the American community, in the broad sense of North and South America.

I wonder whether the Senator has in mind the submission of a concurrent resolution which, of course, would not be binding on the executive, but could express the sense of the Congress that recognition be withdrawn from Red Cuba.

If the Senator has such a thought in mind, I shall be glad to support him. I congratulate the Senator for his speech.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator very much for that which he has had to say, for his commendation and his expressed agreement.

I at this time do not contemplate submitting a resolution for the recognition of the Cuban Government in exile. However, feeling as the able Senator does about the menace of communism in Cuba and the dangers to the remainder of the area, if we do not get on quickly with respect to the problem of bringing more pressure on the government of Castro and ridding Cuba of communism and Castro, I shall adopt the suggestion the Senator has made and submit such a resolution. I thank the Senator very much for his thought.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's comment. The Senator may be assured of my support at that time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Finally, Mr. President, in our efforts to help Latin America we sometimes lose sight of the different conditions which surround democracy there and in our own country.

Ours is a sophisticated system which has experienced nearly 200 years of testing and refining. We revere our system and would like to extend its benefits to all—if the people actually want it.

But we must remember that we cannot plant the U.S. strain of democracy and have it bear fruit in soil which cannot now nourish it. Before democracy, as we know it, can thrive, the conditions precedent of that democracy—universal education, at least 70 or 80 percent literacy, a free and popular press, an experienced electorate—must be provided. Our Alliance for Progress is helping to establish these social and economic conditions, and certainly we all encourage that effort.

It is those men who are thoughtful, temperate, and far-sighted in their judgment, those who favor patient, responsible action to eliminate existing inequities, who support the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

Let us remember that there is a great ally at work for freemen in Latin America. It is the fact that communism and human dignity are incompatible.

The Communists say that there is nothing in the world except matter in motion. And if that is so, if man is just matter in motion, man has no more rights and no greater dignity than dust upon a desk or a puff of smoke curling in the sky. We in the United States say "No," and democracy also says "That is not true."

At the very beginning of our Nation we chose to exalt and preserve the human dignity of each citizen.

It is this recognition of that basic dignity which, above all else, motivates our Alliance for Progress.

It is that recognition which can give the Alliance the strength to succeed, to safeguard freedom and justice not only for the Latin American people, but also for our own people as well.

I take this opportunity to thank the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who has yielded this time to me. His customary generosity has made it possible for me to make this speech at this time and to meet some other appointments. I am greatly indebted to the Senator from Louisiana.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I support the bill (H.R. 11040) as reported from the Commerce Committee.

The bill, the details of which have been hammered out by the Space Committee and the Commerce Committee and which was overwhelmingly endorsed

by a vote of 354 to 9 by the other body, offers us a unique opportunity. It represents the first opportunity for us as a Nation to extend our social structure into outer space.

In doing this, how shall we proceed? Shall we adhere to our traditional and successful policies of private ownership? Or shall we cast them aside for Government ownership? I think the answer is clear.

I think the recent hearings have shown beyond peradventure that private ownership, under regulation, as proposed in this bill, is the way to develop the most efficient, most economical, most speedy, and the most well-run communications satellite system.

The idea appears to be held by a few of our colleagues that our privately owned companies are not quite equal to the challenge posed by a communications satellite system. This to me represents a narrow and one-sided view of the matter.

Some months ago the Wall Street Journal, in an editorial appropriately entitled "Socialism in the Sky," approached the question of Government ownership this way:

If along about the turn of the century some dreamers had come forward with a plan to put one of these new-fangled telephones in every home and hook together every city and hamlet, they might well have concluded that this was beyond the resources of private industry.

Only government itself, so it might have seemed, could take on a job of such magnitude in money and planning. Indeed, in a great many countries the job was taken on by governments and, to this very day, the telephone systems are run by the government, like the postal services.

But fortunately this country lagged the rest of the world in socialistic economics; our telephone system was allowed to grow in free soil. And it would be laboring the obvious to point out that here the dream has not only come true but has been surpassed. The contrast between our phone system and those operated by governments is a dramatic one to anybody who has spent even a few vacation weeks abroad.

If you doubt which system is the better—government or private—pick up the telephone, phone your local postmaster and ask for more mail service. And see how far you get.

The record shows that the contributions of private industry in the satellite communications area have been substantial both in the basic communications arts involved and in testing the satellites in the space environment. One private company alone has spent more than \$1 billion on its own research and development program in fields closely pertinent to today's satellite communications system development. The satellites themselves, for example, are essentially microwave repeaters, and microwave has been used by our communications carriers since 1946. And without such additional developments as the transistor, the solar cell, the maser, and the traveling wave tube—all products of our privately owned communications industry—there would be no satellite system.

We need the rockets, too, but let me read what a distinguished member of the

Harvard faculty, John Chamberlain, has recently written on this subject:

The postwar period brought forth one electronic invention that added a new dimension to the business. This was the tiny transistor, which was produced by Dr. William Shockley and a team of Bell Labs scientists in 1948. The transistor, a three-electrode tube of solid matter that could be substituted for the glass vacuum tube, met all of the requirements for the miniaturization needed to give real impetus to the rocket and missile age. * * * By 1951 any company could obtain any use of the transistor patents by paying \$25,000 advance on royalties. * * * The show has been a gorgeous one, making possible the whole vast new enterprise of space exploration. "A History of American Business," *Fortune*, May 1962, pp. 148 and 254.)

Then too, we cannot overlook the fact that the first prototype of a commercial communications satellite, Telstar, which is scheduled to be launched in a matter of weeks was financed and constructed solely by private industry. To give an idea of the importance of private contributions to the success of the proposed system it is worth noting that Telstar has some 3,600 solar cells and is jammed packed with electronic equipment, including a specially designed and highly reliable traveling wave tube, more than 1,000 transistors and nearly 1,500 diodes. These are all products of privately financed research and development programs.

In the face of the undisputed excellence of our present communications facilities and of the substantial contributions of private industry in the satellite communications area, and of the clear statements in favor of a private enterprise approach to this matter by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and others, what arguments have been advanced to support Government ownership? There have been principally three: First, it is claimed the satellite system has been made possible by Government expenditures and it would be unconscionable to turn the benefit from such expenditures over to a privately owned corporation; second, it alleged that the system will inevitably be dominated by a few private corporations and such domination can only effectively be prevented by Government ownership; and, third, it is a further claim that it would be foolhardy to commit ourselves now to an organizational arrangement while further research, development and experimentation remain to be accomplished. Let us take these one at a time:

First, the contributions by private enterprise to the proposed satellite system have already been mentioned and have been documented in much greater detail elsewhere. Suffice it to say that it is a complete distortion to attempt to depict private enterprise as standing idly by, while the Government conceived the concepts in this area and carried them to fruition with public money. In accordance with the principles first enunciated by President Eisenhower in December 1960 and restated by President Kennedy, both Government and private industry have made their respective contributions.

It is distressing to hear all these assertions that the Government is turning over a satellite system and billions in taxpayer money to the proposed corporation. If billions have been spent on such a facility, where is the evidence of it? The Government has no actual communications satellite or ground station in operation. Our colleagues know this.

I dislike reading extensive excerpts from hearings into this record, but on this occasion I feel compelled to do so. The following is from pages 40-41 of the printed record of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly:

Senator KEFAUVER. What is the Government turning over to the corporation?

Mr. WELSH. There is a certain amount of know-how, of course, which is being turned over as a result of experimentation.

Other than that, the bill would provide for every shot, every launching, every rocket used, and so forth, to be paid for by the corporation, so that the corporation would be expected to be self-sustaining in that regard.

Senator KEFAUVER. I know, but I mean what is the value of the property that is going to be turned over to the corporation? Will the satellites belong to the corporation?

Mr. WELSH. There are not any satellites now, sir.

And as to the so-called know-how, Mr. Welsh continued:

It is know-how, most of which is already available to the general community and to the industry. It is not any know-how that we have a monopoly on in the Government.

Second, let us consider the domination argument. What are the risks of domination by a few companies or any one company?

The legislative proposal before us would prohibit all authorized carriers as a group from owning, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the shares issued by the corporation. Since at least five of the major carriers have indicated a desire to have an ownership interest, any single carrier's stock ownership will perform be less than 50 percent. Furthermore no communications carrier can vote, directly or indirectly, for more than three of the corporation's 15 directors. Could this possibly permit control of the management of the corporation by any one carrier? Restrictions are also contained on the ownership and voting by noncarriers.

The legislation also requires full non-discriminatory use of the system by all authorized carriers. Could any single company, in some totally unexplained manner, so control the corporation that it could obtain a preference in the use of the corporation's facilities in the face of such an explicit provision, and in view of the powers granted to the FCC and the Attorney General to enforce this requirement?

The legislation further requires that apparatus, equipment, and services procured by the corporation shall be on a competitive basis. In fact it goes so far as to impose upon the FCC the obligation to consult with the Small Business Administration to insure that small business is given an opportunity to sell to the corporation. Could anyone, again by a totally unexplained process, so con-

trol the corporation to favor itself despite the sanctions contained in the bill? Under these circumstances, the possibility of domination—whether in the use of the system's facilities, in the acquisition of its equipment, or in its management—is nothing more than a fiction used to becloud the issue.

Third, that we should delay the organizational decision is perhaps the most transparent of the arguments advanced by the exponents of Government ownership. The need to proceed as rapidly as possible has been stressed by both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, and has been repeated again and again by responsible people both in and out of government. There is not a single fact not now known which should have any bearing of consequence upon the proper organizational structure for the satellite system. They have all been exhaustively set forth in an endless series of committee hearings both here and in the other body. Furthermore our private industry cannot continue to spend its own money for research and development—as in Project Telstar—when their ownership rights in the ultimate system remain obscure. Thus delay can only serve to increase the possibility of Government ownership—and its advocates know this, and hope to take advantage of it. Unimportant to them apparently is the fact that our delay will inevitably increase the possibility that the Russians will succeed before we do.

Let us recognize these arguments for what they are—window dressing. During the recent Commerce Committee hearings Senator CASE asked the Senator from Tennessee (p. 310):

I take it you are really opposed to this being a private corporation as far as the satellite system is concerned, in any form; is that correct?

The response was as follows:

My feeling is that—yes, my own personal feeling would be that permanently we would be better off if the main part of the communications system were owned by the Government.

So, it is not simply a question of delay at all. It is whether the Government should "permanently" own this system.

I urge that we pass this bill and get on with the job with all possible speed.

WALT W. ROSTOW'S DRAFT OF STRATEGY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, over the past weekend there appeared in the Sunday and Monday morning editions of the Chicago Tribune two lengthy stories under the byline of Willard Edwards purporting to digest the so-called Rostow draft of a blueprint for future strategy in the struggle against communism.

For many months now we have been told that this document has been in a state of preparation under the guiding hand of Walt W. Rostow, State Department counselor and chairman of its Policy Planning Board.

On several occasions there have appeared in the press other stories discussing this draft of strategy, but none has

presented so much in such detail as Mr. Edwards' story and I am impelled to believe that it is probably accurate.

Many of us who are not unfamiliar with Rostow's thinking have awaited the birth of this new master strategy with considerable trepidation. Mr. Rostow has never been a very devoted disciple of the tough policy line toward Russia. It now develops, on the basis of the Chicago Tribune articles, that Mr. Rostow holds some unique ideas about the Soviet Union that are considerably closer to the fuzzy thinking of the late and lamented "Liberal Papers" than even the most liberal Member of this body would be willing to accept.

The core of Mr. Rostow's proposal is an assumption that the Soviet Union and its Communist masters are "mellowing"; that Russia is becoming a mature state; that if we are only nice to the Soviets they will drop all of their suspicions of the free world and peace will finally bloom.

The most amazing Rostow thesis is this: That both the United States and Russia are losing power and authority in their respective worlds and that an area of "overlapping interests" is developing in which meaningful agreements may be concluded between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

Mr. Rostow sees no victory by the United States over the Soviet Union. Mr. Rostow sees no victory by capitalism over communism. In fact Mr. Rostow is a man of little hope and the last person in my opinion who should have been chosen for the all-important task of directing the continuing review of our foreign policy.

The basic philosophy of successful conflict is always to pursue a winning course and always change a losing game. Every high school coach, every big league manager knows this. But apparently our State Department planners do not.

If Mr. Rostow's assumption that the Soviet Union is softening is correct, then what may I ask caused it to mellow? To me the answer is obvious. The only times we have ever gotten anywhere with the Soviet Union—the only times the Soviet Union has ever mellowed—have been when the United States was tough.

So logic would say that if Mr. Rostow's basic assumption were correct and that the Soviet Union is softening, Mr. Rostow is recommending a course exactly diametric to American interests.

But the disconcerting part of the whole picture is this: Our intelligence agencies say there is little or no evidence to support any such assumption as that made by Mr. Rostow.

How does Mr. Rostow explain the recent Russian course of breaking the moratorium on nuclear testing? How does he explain their recent announcement that they are now going to test a 100-megaton bomb in retaliation for our resumption of testing?

Does the presence of our Armed Forces in Thailand indicate the Communists are mellowing? Does the presence of our Armed Forces in Vietnam indicate the Communists are mellowing?

I think the Senate is entitled to know—perhaps through questioning by the appropriate committee—what intelligence information Mr. Rostow possesses to support his basic assumption. Mr. Edwards' articles indicate that Mr. Rostow has held this opinion for at least 10 years. If it is only opinion, I would suggest that it is not proper ground on which to stake the entire future of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks Mr. Edwards' articles, so that the Senate may examine them in detail.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 17, 1962]

DRAFT FOREIGN POLICY REVISION BOWING TO REDS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—A master plan for historic changes in U.S. foreign policy has been readied for President Kennedy's consideration.

It embraces the theme that the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policies are mellowing and the way is open for meaningful agreement between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

This proposed guide for future decisions by the President and the National Security Council, the Nation's highest strategy group, advances these theories:

Russia's leaders are beginning to realize that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can defeat the other in the world of the future.

FIND NO BASIS FOR IT

Both the United States and Russia are losing power and authority in their respective areas and an area of overlapping interests is developing in which mutually profitable agreements may be negotiated.

Envisioning, as it does, Communist abandonment of the goal of world conquest, this blueprint for future strategy has aroused heated dispute from military leaders and intelligence agencies who can detect no evidence to support its assumptions.

They quarrel with the contention that conciliation can be as important as a strong defense in future relations with the Kremlin.

Leading sponsor of the plan, which has been more than a year in preparation, is Walt W. Rostow, State Department counselor and Chairman of its Policy Planning Board. He acknowledges that a strong educational campaign will be needed to sell Congress and the public if the proposals are given official sanction.

SHAPED CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

Compiled under Rostow's supervision, the strategy plan represents the work of many officials in the White House, State, Treasury, and Defense Departments. It has been steadily revised and edited down, from an original volume of 285 pages to a shorter draft.

Despite a host of contributors, the plans bears the Rostow stamp. A former member of the faculty of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rostow, 45, is the President's top foreign policy adviser. He played a major role in shaping Kennedy's foreign policy speeches in the Presidential campaign and was deputy special assistant to the President until he took over his present State Department post last December 6.

Rostow's brand of philosophy, not concealed in books, articles, theses, and speeches in recent years, has always envisioned the "evolution" of Soviet Russia into a "mature" state which will come to realize the out-

dating of the Marxian theory of the class struggle as the moving force in history.

FOR A NEW YOUNG PRESIDENT

As long ago as 1956, he voiced confidence that Communist leaders in the next decade would mend their ways and in 1958 he was depicting Russia as about ready to enter "the age of high mass consumption" reached by the United States a quarter century earlier.

He has now translated this optimistic conviction into a blueprint for basic national security policy, designed to govern future decisions at the highest levels.

It is a conception calculated to stimulate and enthuse a new, young President who could insure a secure place in history as the American leader who brought peace to the world, ending not only the dread potentialities of nuclear conflict, but the harassments of cold war conflicts which drain the economy.

NOT A SHRED OF PROOF

It is also a theory which has stirred many in the Government's intelligence agencies to alarm. They report not a scrap of hard data to support the roseate assumptions of the State Department planner.

They note no lessening of Communist intransigence nor of grim determination to "bury" the free world. They see in the Rostow recommendations a total misconception of the nature of the Communist conspiracy; a naive brushing off of its treachery as evidenced in a long history of broken treaties and agreements while steadily pursuing the goal of world conquest.

Rostow believes that Premier Nikita Khrushchev of Russia and his associates do not want a major war. He concedes their desire for a total victory for communism but he glimpses changes beneath the surface of old Communist objectives and a willingness among some in Russia to modify old ideological formula in the light of changing reality.

UNITED STATES ON WANE, HE SAYS

Neither Russia nor the United States is going to dominate this century, he contends. To those who speak of a "victory" or "win" policy in the cold war, he retorts that neither of the great leading nations will win over the other. Capitalism will not triumph over socialism. Rather, the victory will be one of "men and nations" voluntarily cooperating under the principles of the United Nations Charter.

"And we deeply believe this victory will come—on both sides of the Iron Curtain," he concludes.

The policy outline pictures the United States and Russia as two aging combatants, both showing signs of waning prestige and power. There is a diffusion of power away from Moscow within the Communist bloc, it asserts, and away from the United States within the free world.

In lesser degree, the "evolution" theory is also applied to Red China and the same conciliatory tactics are advocated. The Chinese Communists can be encouraged to "evolution" into a peaceful state by showing them we have no aggressive intentions.

Possibilities should be explored for expanding contact with Red China, placing it, according to one objector, in the same position as Yugoslavia and Poland.

CAN'T PROMOTE A SPLIT

There is no final bar to entrance of Communist China into more normal relations with the United States if they are prepared to modify present policies, the policy paper asserts. In the meantime, unnecessary provocations should be avoided and informal negotiations pursued.

There is little that the United States can do to promote a Sino-Soviet split, the paper contends.

The proposed foreign policy guidebook does not suggest any weakening of national defense and includes recommendations for a greater buildup of the Nation's capacity to wage conventional warfare.

It estimates Soviet policy as designed to avoid any actions which would bring about a nuclear war, ruling out the belief of many military leaders that the Communists will strike whenever they think they can destroy us.

WE WILL WAIT TO BE HIT

Any idea of the United States contemplating a "first strike" is ruled out. Planning in that direction is not relevant since the United States does not plan to initiate a nuclear attack on Communist nations. Military men assail the section as against all sound principles of war for which planning against all contingencies is essential.

Despite all rebuffs to date, strenuous efforts should be continued to get an agreement on limited arms control, the policy paper recommends. It is suggested that the United States might advance a program not requiring formal negotiations.

Again, objectors to this recommendation argued, the proposal totally disregards the nature of the Communist enemy. Any information furnished to Communists will be used against us and any such action will never change their basic aims.

REDS GOING PEACEFUL

Since both arms control planning and research and military planning are directed toward national security, the strategy outline asserts, they should be integrated. General and complete disarmament is a goal which must never be obscured.

There was objection from military men to inclusion of this section. They argued that the nature of communism is disregarded in a process of reasoning which contends that the United States will be secure in a disarmed world.

In seeming answer to these contentions, the proposed policy emphasizes the assumption that the Soviet policy will evolve into a peaceful state.

Even if Communist leaders are unwilling to share the U.S. image of the world's future in the degree necessary to negotiate major arms reduction programs, they may come to realize the dangers of accident, miscalculation, and failure of communications and thus be willing to join the United States in limited measures to reduce those dangers.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 18, 1962]
SOFT RED LINE MUST BE "SOLD"—ROSTOW
(By William Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—A systematic publicity campaign will be necessary to sell Congress and the American people on the merits of a bold new foreign policy advocating conciliation of Russia, a State Department planner has advised.

The problem of this gap between Government and popular thinking is tackled with candor by Walt W. Rostow, chairman of the State Department's policy planning board in his draft of a master plan which awaits President Kennedy's consideration.

The new policy, the work of a number of experts in Government under Rostow's supervision, is based upon the theory that Russian domestic and foreign policies have melted during the post-Stalin period. It holds the way has been opened for cooperation between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

EDUCATION IS NEEDED

Since the evidence in the form of deeds and words by Soviet leaders, runs directly contrary to this assumption, Congress and the people, the Rostow outline confesses, must be educated to acceptance of a fresh approach.

In typical State Department parlance, this can be accomplished by "systematic exposition in forms appropriate for public presentation." The term "indoctrination" is avoided.

One of the appropriate methods of public enlightenment, favored highly by the Kennedy administration, is the newspaper "leak." This involves funneling of selected information to favored reporters.

CITE "OUTMODED" POLICIES

Although the Rostow document is presumed to be confidential and described by a State Department spokesman as a "working draft," hints of its contents have been leaked in the last 3 months to three newspapers, a news magazine, and a syndicated column. The resulting articles in the main, feature it as "a premise, balanced, and complete master plan of global objectives and strategies" which would replace "old policies," manufactured under crisis conditions.

These inspired stories lacked detail, in most instances, but stressed the need for replacement of policies "left over" from the Eisenhower administration. The existence of "ambiguities" had permitted dispute between partisans of different concepts and contributed to varying interpretations of policy, they noted.

HINT ON A-STRATEGY

One "leak" was definite, however, in reporting a provision that the United States would never strike the first nuclear blow unless it were faced with a massive conventional assault, such as a full-scale invasion of Western Europe.

Another revealed proposed new policies for dealing with the problem of the "two Chinas" on the mainland and Formosa.

Speeches and statements by administration spokesmen to condition Congress and the public to the new policy are also suggested in the Rostow document. Rostow has set a good example in this respect. In a number of addresses, he has stated his conviction that neither the United States nor Russia can win the cold war, that capitalism will not triumph over communism, and that the fate of the world will be settled by forces now at work on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

SEES NEW LINEUP

In a speech June 3 at Minneapolis, Rostow said:

"It is sometimes asked if our policy is a no-win policy. Our answer is this—we do not expect this planet to be forever split between a Communist bloc and a free world. We expect this planet to organize itself in time on the principles of voluntary cooperation among independent nation states dedicate to human freedom. We expect the principle that 'governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed' to triumph on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

"It will not be a victory of the United States over Russia. It will be a victory of men and nations over the forces that wish to entrap and to exploit their revolutionary aspirations."

In another speech to the special warfare school at Fort Bragg, N.C., he voiced the same sentiments and added: "It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism."

Two years ago, in a California speech, he outlined Russia's fears that other nations would get the nuclear bomb, calling the prospect of nuclear weapons in Chinese hands "a latent nightmare" for the Kremlin.

RUSSIA OUR ALLY

He saw in this a possibility that Russia might find "the only logical course is to make a common cause with the United States to establish a minimum framework of order."

Thus, Rostow's policy draft contains few surprises to students of his record. He is

aware of the initial lack of popular acceptance which will greet its unfolding. Suggested in the draft is a shifting of emphasis, particularly in the public consciousness, from the problem of opposing Communist aggression to exploiting opportunities in building and extending "a community of free nations."

These "opportunities" are described in the document as growing from a gathering historical trend toward fragmentation in the Communist bloc and some relaxation of internal controls in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Thus, Communist regimes and peoples are to be dealt with in terms of "overlapping interest," a phrase which is also popular with Rostow in public statements.

The United States Information Agency must be used abroad to define and dramatize the "limited but real areas of overlapping interests" between the United States and other governments and peoples, the paper asserts.

Students of Communist policy eye this alleged intertwining of interests with strong doubt, noting that Communists have never admitted any interest which lies outside world domination.

One theme is consistent in the proposed strategy plan—continuing communication with Russia, informal and formal, direct and indirect, must be maintained in order to dispel its fears of the United States, and give it a clear understanding of our peaceful intentions.

Rising tensions or the pleas of our allies or of the American public must be ignored in any crisis with Russia. The temptation must be avoided to prolong or expand any crisis in an effort to degrade or embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world.

The Soviet Union, the paper advises, must be granted its status as a great power and induced, by word and deed, to fuller participation and influence in the community of free nations if its leaders show a genuine interest and will for such constructive consideration.

EASY ON SATELLITES

Gentle treatment of the satellite nations is advocated. No official attacks should be made against their regimes, whatever the provocation, and even criticism should be softened. Western Europe, at the same time, must be encouraged to closer relationship with the satellites and urged to furnish aid to them.

East Germany, the policy draft says, cannot be forever insulated from dealings with the United States and business must be transacted with them.

Above all, no encouragement or support must be given to armed uprisings in eastern Europe. This is a continuance of policy in existence for several years.

These proposals, one critic noted, will in effect recognize the satellites, including East Germany, as legitimate regimes, disregard the principle of self-determination, and cause the captive peoples to lose all hope of freeing themselves from Communist rule.

A POPULAR WORD

The plan is concerned with the promotion of rapid industrial growth and full employment in the United States. Unless there is great prosperity here, it noted, it will be extremely difficult to obtain congressional and popular consent for allocation of resources to international purposes or liberal trade adjustments.

The word "modernization" appears frequently in the plan in relation to the development of nations. The strength of international communism, it states, can best be sapped by strengthening the performance of the free community through "modernization." Opponents of the policy draft have

suggested that "modernization" may be a synonym for "Democratic socialization."

The United States must expand its participation in institutions and organizations "which transcend the independent powers of the nation-state," the outline proposes.

It seeks progressive moves toward a legal order which lays down and enforces essential rules of conduct in interstate relations which will "provide sure and equitable means for the settlement of international disputes."

Again, in arguments over this proposal, it was noted that it presupposes Communist submission to the law. One expert recalled the sardonic comment made by the late Andrei Y. Vishinsky, chief delegate to the United Nations. He once told the U.N.:

"What laws? We make our own. We do not abide by bourgeois laws."

SEEKS MODERN ALLIES

On balance, the draft asserts, American interests will be better served by leaning toward nations with modern ideas rather than sticking to old allies with outmoded notions. The paper identifies neither the modern states nor the old friends, conceding no general rule can cover this situation.

As a final touch, the policy paper suggests that denial of foreign aid can be as useful as supplying it. In Laos, where aid was withdrawn to force a coalition with Communists, this policy has already been implemented, it was noted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I might add, as a postscript, that I believe a great deal more will be said about this subject because without doubt it will be one of the most important challenges before the American people and this country as we deal with this comment upon the so-called policy or strategy that we are to employ in the days ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, may I address an inquiry to the distinguished minority leader?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Every further adumbration of the views of Mr. Rostow is useful to the security of the country, because if Mr. Rostow and the other mellow-minded persons in the Department of State seriously feel, as apparently they do, that one should expect a change in Russian attitudes tending toward accommodation, which I suppose means accommodation to our views, does the Senator from Illinois receive any consolation from anyone else in the State Department who is upholding the other view, namely, that the Russian Communists cannot be trusted? Has the Senator searched to determine whether anyone has advocated a strong view or a tough view against Russia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I think that in the Pentagon a strong view is well supported by a good many persons. But with respect to the belief that the Soviet Union is mellowing, only last week Minister Khrushchev was in southeastern Asia, and there he proclaimed all over again one of his famous phrases, namely, that he still believed he was going to "bury the United States." That does not sound to me like mellow or pacific language.

Mr. SCOTT. The fuzzy mellow mind-fulness of Mr. Rostow and those who follow his theory reminds me of a story I heard a long time ago concerning a man who was somewhat inebriated, and who walked up to a very long bar and was desirous of engaging in conversation with someone, because he thought he had very sound views. He approached another similarly inebriated gentleman and, tapping him on the shoulder, asked, "Have you heard the rumor?" The gentleman said, "No," he had not, and advised his newly found inebriated pal to go away. So then the drunken man moved to the center of the bar and asked the bartender, "Have you heard the rumor?" The bartender said, "I'm too busy to talk to you."

So the fellow went to the other end of the bar and asked an even more—if possible—inebriated gentleman, "Have you heard the rumor?" as he clasped him firmly by the lapels and looked at him eye to eye, and nose to nose, with the alcoholic friendship that one associates with such an action. This man, unlike the first, removing the hands of the questioner from his lapels, said "Yes, but never with such detail." [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps inebriety is one of the ways to blind reality; but if it is reality with which we are dealing—all these reports of the strategic blueprint as now examined and as have appeared in other sources—I think it is high time we familiarized ourselves with the implications. To go down that road very far may possibly spell disaster for our country.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding the time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield such time as he may desire to the Senator from Ohio, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I read in the New York Times of today a report from Washington, which reads as follows:

A House subcommittee has cut the heart out of President Kennedy's proposed \$695 million civil defense program. Meeting in closed session Friday, the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee eliminated the entire \$460 million requested by the Department of Defense to start a nationwide fallout shelter program July 1.

The move was seen also as an indication of congressional apathy and of the evaporation of public concern over shelters since the Berlin crisis of last summer. It was noted also that President Kennedy had not publicly urged approval of the program in recent months and had made no plans to do so.

The subcommittee is headed by Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas.

Mr. President, as an administration Senator, it is the desire of the junior Senator from Ohio to support the ad-

ministration's policies and to support President Kennedy whenever I can, in good conscience, do so.

However, it is my opinion that the subcommittee which took this action and its chairman, the distinguished Representative from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, are to be praised for their forthrightness in saving the taxpayers a huge sum of money—almost \$500 million. I compliment them upon their action.

Some years ago I served in the other body with Representative ALBERT THOMAS, and through the years I have held him in the highest admiration. He is one of the ablest, most thoughtful, and most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. I hope the Senate will follow the fine leadership which has been displayed by the House subcommittee in eliminating the entire \$460 million requested for fallout shelters.

Mr. President, billions of dollars of taxpayers' money has already gone down the drain and has been wasted in futile and foolish civil defense projects during the years from 1950 until this good hour. Experts have testified that anywhere from \$20 billion to \$200 billion would be required for a national shelter program, a program which might possibly—and I say "possibly"—be effective to any extent at all.

Under the leadership of Leo Hoegh and other politicians who operated the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization in the past, more than \$1 billion of hard earned taxpayers' money has been utterly wasted. It should be heartening to the American people that the House subcommittee took this action, which the Senate should follow.

Unless we are prepared to embark on a vast gamble of spending from \$20 to \$200 billion, then I maintain it is an utter waste to spend additional hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on schemes which are, in reality, nothing more than expensive doses of psychological pabulum for a frightened and bewildered public seeking some way out of the dilemma of our times. It would be far better to spend the money to strengthen our Armed Forces and our retaliatory capability, so that no aggressor would dare to attack us.

We are confronted with a dilemma. I quote Jonathan Swift, who wrote:

A strong dilemma in a desperate case:
To act with infamy or quit the place.

It is high time that Congress quit wasting the taxpayers' money on a boondoggle such as civil defense as it has been conducted. For a while, the Nation had an evacuation program. In case of an attack, the citizens of my home city of Cleveland, for example, running away from Cleveland along the road to the west toward Lorain, would meet the citizens of Lorain running east on the same road to Cleveland, to escape the falling bombs. The futility and foolishness of this scheme were apparent to everyone. More recently, a fallout-shelter program has been undertaken.

Mr. President, the administration should immediately drop this program,

and follow the decision of the subcommittee of the other body, under the great leadership of Representative ALBERT THOMAS. If the administration does not choose to do so, I hope it will at least proceed to reevaluate the whole problem.

Mass evacuation was offered as the panacea only a few years ago, but it is now seen as an illusion. Fallout shelters are no better. The basic fact about nuclear war is that organized society cannot survive it. No amount of warnings, sermons, or reams of type will change this fact. It would be wiser to face the truth squarely, than to evade it by talking of the survival of some individuals.

Maj. Gen. John Medaris, now retired, one of the outstanding authorities on missilery, and former Chief of the Army Ordnance Missile Command, denounced civil defense as it has been conducted. He said:

The concept of mass evacuation of high-density population centers and the burial of our citizenry in deep shelters would negate any kind of positive reaction to attack. It would convert our people into a horde of rabbits scurrying for warrens where they would cower helplessly while waiting the coming of a conqueror.

Mr. President, his conclusion is the same as mine—namely, that the "Navy's Polaris system is the best bet for the retaliatory striking power for the near future. It offers the advantage of concealment to a much more realistic degree than the entombment of concrete-protected, land-based missiles," or in holes in the ground.

I should like to support the program proposed by the administration, for I like to support President Kennedy in every particular; but I cannot do so to the extent of voting to use taxpayers' money for any such program, for it is based on a defeatist psychology. Why should Americans, with their great history and their noble tradition, in the event of a sudden attack from the Soviet Union rush for holes in the ground, or into the basements of public buildings, or into shelters in their homes, and cower there and shiver in the darkness, waiting for the conquering paratroopers to come? It does not make sense.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been advised that late researches indicate that a person who constructs a fallout shelter finds himself in the same plight, insofar as taxation is concerned, that an old North Carolina farmer is reputed to have found himself in. It is said that many years ago he had the following misfortunes:

His old horse died and his mule went lame;
Then he lost six cows in a poker game.
Then a hurricane came on a summer's day,
And blew the house where he lived away.

An earthquake came, when that was gone,
And swallowed the land his house stood on.
Then the tax collector came around,
And assessed him up for a hole in the ground.

I understand that a person who builds a fallout shelter suffers the same fate—in other words, that he winds up being taxed for a hole in the ground. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In many instances that is correct. I am most grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina for mentioning this matter. The situation throughout the country is similar to that in the State represented here by the Senator from North Carolina; and his contribution to this presentation of this most serious situation is very welcome, indeed.

Let me also refer to a county assessor in Nevada, who recently stated that fallout shelters increase the value of real property, and are taxable. That statement prompted Richard Armour, of Nevada, to lament in the following language:

Consider the citizen, bent on survival,
Who, fearing the day of the H-bomb's arrival,
Digs deep in his yard, and digs deep in his pocket,
One eye ever upward, alert for a rocket.

And then, while he waits for the siren and whistle

That warn to beware of the onrushing missile,
Comes not the expected, awaited aggressor,
But he, still more fatal, the County Assessor.

And though there's no fallout, he draws his last breath,
Not bombed, the poor fellow, but taxed to death.

Mr. President, during the Second World War, 60,000 residents of Hamburg, Germany, perished in their civil defense shelters within the course of a few hours. They perished from suffocation, as a result of firestorms caused by an intensive bombing raid on July 27, 1943. But that raid—as the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina knows, and as all the rest of us know—was infinitesimal in its destructive power, compared with the destructive power of one atomic bomb with a 1-megaton yield.

It is estimated that the lethal radioactive fallout from a 10-megaton thermonuclear explosion would cover several thousand square miles. The resulting firestorm would cover an area of 5,000 square miles. Our cities would be blazing pyres and a mass of radioactive debris. Shelters in the target area would be crushed. Any who managed to escape these blazing tombs would be immediately killed by the firestorms and explosions raging for miles around.

The President's desire, as stated some months ago, although I am very happy to say that there has been silence on that subject since then, was to offer Americans some form of survival insurance in event of nuclear attack. That is laudable, and certainly some sensible forms of catastrophe planning are in order.

However, no sound planning will divert substantial resources and effort into a program which offers very little true insurance. What has been offered could well assume the proportions of a

continuous, endless boondoggle, and would encourage a cruel illusion of security.

Not one American is one whit safer in event of nuclear war as the result of the expenditures which we appropriated for shelters last year, totaling \$207 million. Does anyone believe for 1 minute that the appropriation of millions of dollars—now exceeding \$1 billion—for our civil defense program in the past has deterred aggressive intentions and actions of the Communist dictators?

No reasonable person would object to the Federal Government's advising citizens on the type, effectiveness, and cost of various fallout shelters. A modest amount of money could be appropriated for research and dissemination of this information. If the individual citizen wants to build his own shelter and feels that he lives in an area where it could possibly be of some use to him and his family, or if he wants to build a recreation room or bar room in his basement, stock it with food, and call it a shelter, that is his own business, so long as he does not expect the Federal Government to give him a tax advantage for it.

When he does that, an individual is at least helping a building contractor and a grocer to put some money into circulation. If he wants to do so, that is his own business. He can waste his money as he sees fit. However, I object to any multibillion dollar shelter program on the part of the Federal Government at taxpayers' expense.

Although the international situation is no less critical, the hysteria and fear of last summer have somewhat subsided. One of the signs of this change is that it has been a long time since Americans have talked about fallout shelters. The problem should be, and now can be, viewed calmly and sensibly. Representative THOMAS and his subcommittee have done just that. It is my hope that when the Senate considers the independent offices appropriation bill we shall follow the example set by the House of Representatives Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee under the leadership of a great Representative, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

It is better for us to face the fact that no modern society can survive all-out nuclear war, rather than to delude ourselves by inadequate efforts to try to assure the survival of some individuals.

Instead, we should concentrate our energies and our skills in doing our utmost to bring about an end to the armaments race between this Nation and the Soviet Union and Red China.

History tells us that since the turn of the century every armaments race has eventually lead to world war. Therefore, let us bend our energies toward bringing about disarmament and arms control with adequate safeguards. Of course, we must insist upon the latter. The Soviet Union has violated agreement after agreement. We must have safeguards that permit international inspection teams to come into this country and to go throughout the Soviet Union and Red China. We must be realistic about this problem. In order to have effective

arms control and an effective disarmament agreement, we must have adequate and proper safeguards. That is the goal we should be seeking, instead of proposing to squander the taxpayers' money on a futile civilian defense program.

It is serious business indeed to waste taxpayers' money. Again I desire to laud the fine work of the subcommittee of the other body in denying this administration's request for nearly one-half billion dollars, which would be an utter waste of taxpayers' money. I am glad that the item has been deleted. I hope that when the independent offices appropriation bill is considered in this body Senators will join with me in voting against any appropriation that would cause a waste of our money on fallout shelters which, in the end, would be utterly futile.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield first to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and then to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for such time as they may desire, without prejudice to my right to the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED STRIKE AGAINST TWA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the flight engineers plan to strike the Trans World Airline system tomorrow.

If this occurs, it will throw many thousands of people out of work, thousands of them in my own State of Missouri.

It should be clearly realized that once again the problem is disagreement between two unions; that it has relatively little to do with the three basic aspects of unionism—wages, hours, or conditions of work.

It is inconceivable that this union at this time would go through with this strike, thereby deliberately going against the urgent request of both the President and the Secretary of Labor; namely, to go to arbitration.

If the strike takes place because of this difference between these two unions, it would seem the Congress would have to give speedy attention to how to solve problems of this character in the public interest.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Kansas City Times of Saturday, June 16, "A Pattern To Solve Air Disputes Is at Hand," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PATTERN TO SOLVE AIR DISPUTES IS AT HAND

In what could be a devastating airline strike, the pattern for settlement already has been worked out by a White House panel. If they strike, the flight engineers will be ignoring the public interest and national in-

terest which are represented in this high-level panel.

The main issue turns on the problem of how to cut jet cockpit crews from four men to three. Unions and management in the industry have agreed with the Presidential board that only three men are needed. The present arrangement provides for three pilots and a flight engineer.

On this issue of the crew makeup, TWA, Pan American, and Eastern Air Lines face the immediate possibility of a strike. It comes down to a question of whether the flight engineers union or the pilots union would represent the third man in the three-man jet crew. The airlines and the pilots hope for an agreement on a third man qualified as both a pilot and a flight engineer.

If pilot training is required in the combined job, the pilots union is expected to ask the National Mediation Board to declare the cockpit crew a single unit and conduct an election to determine representation for all of the cockpit jobs. The flight engineers, outnumbered 3 to 1, know that they would lose. They fear that a merger with the larger union would cost them their seniority and, eventually, their jobs.

But the White House panel has already proposed a range of job protection measures for the engineers. They would be offered a choice of a ground job, early retirement, sizable severance pay or pilot training to qualify for the three-man crew.

A strike of the three threatened airlines would put 62,000 persons out of work. The economic loss would run into millions of dollars a day. Three of the principal U.S. air carriers would be grounded during one of the busiest seasons of the year. It would cripple air transportation through a large part of the United States and the world.

The flight engineers' fear of arbitration is understandable. Several neutral boards already have recommended the merger of their union with the pilots as the only possible solution.

As President Kennedy pointed out, no one has questioned "either the wisdom or the necessity" of the recommendation by the White House panel last year. A strike would seriously damage the public welfare and the economy. An interruption of air service cannot be justified in the present circumstances, even if the President is forced to go to Congress for emergency seizure powers.

But there is another way out. As the President stated, the flight engineers should either submit their case to arbitration or agree to some other means of settlement. Certainly a crisis of this proportion deserves the benefit of arbitration.

ALLEGED LOBBYING ON THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, first I express my gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana for allowing me to intrude for a few moments on a different subject.

The House has adopted a rather compromise arrangement with relation to extension of the debt limit, and that measure will shortly be before this body for action.

There were disturbing rumors, from more than one source, that the Defense Department was being used—or I should say abused—to lobby for this legislation in the other body.

There were reports that various firms which do business with the Federal Government in the defense field were told to urge their Representatives in Con-

gress to support an increase in the debt ceiling if they wished the firms in their congressional districts to receive prompt and full payment from the Department of Defense for work done.

I trust there will be nothing similar to that when the bill reaches this body. I must say, although I have a very deep interest in the problem of defense contracts, that I have not myself been in any way approached by any firms which do defense work with reference to the pending proposed legislation, now before the Committee on Finance.

I trust that neither I nor any other Senators will be approached in the way it is alleged Representatives have been approached in the other body. That is a clear violation of title 18, section 1913, United States Code, which states:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation.

Mr. President, this direct and flagrant lobbying by the Department of Defense—if it has, in fact, taken place—is not only illegal but also is bound to call into question the basic integrity of government procurement at all levels. A recent article published in a Florida paper, which was called to my attention, indicates that the threat of withholding defense contracts is being used there to keep political insurgents in line. If these allegations are unfounded, the Defense Department should be the first to request an investigation in order to clear its name.

Furthermore, if the present administration is really concerned over the possibility of not having sufficient funds available to pay for defense contracts, there are plenty of areas in which economies might well be made without cutting into vital defense projects.

Every area of Government spending should be investigated and thoroughly explored for possible economies before money is withheld from defense contractors who have done their jobs.

I sincerely trust that nothing like what has been rumored will happen on this side of the Capitol. I am very sure that this kind of lobbying tactic will win no vote in the Senate for the debt limit or any other measure. I also hope, Mr. President, that our Nation's defense contractors will not let themselves be used in this manner by the Defense Department, if that has happened.

I invite attention to General Eisenhower's last words to the Nation when he left office, which were to warn of the potential political power of our Nation's defense and industrial complex. Any attempt by the Defense Department to abuse this power for short term legislative gain would lend added impact to former President Eisenhower's admonition.

For these reasons, if any such effort is made in the Senate, any defense contractors who may make the effort certainly will have reason to expect it will be made a matter of public record.

Because of the rumors and allegations which have been made in the other body, I believe it would be useful if the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations were to reopen the hearings which it has been holding with respect to missile contracts and to extend the scope of this investigation to the entire field of defense procurement. The American people are entitled to know that the \$50 billion we appropriated for defense work will not be used for anything except defense.

Mr. President, we have all been shocked by the revelations in the Billie Sol Estes case and the way in which Agriculture Department funds have found their way into private pockets on a political basis. The Agriculture Department budget is in the nature of \$7 billion. The Defense Department budget is at least seven times as big—\$50 billion. The American people are entitled to know that the Defense Department is living up to its national responsibility and is serving only the defense of the United States.

For these reasons I suggest and urge an immediate and full investigation by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, headed by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], of the charges of pressure tactics by the Defense Department.

One of the first steps should be to get from the Defense Department immediately a list of the firms which were contacted with requests to tell their Representatives to vote right on the pending legislation. Reportedly, if we are to accept the rumors, that is a very long list. This information should be made public by the Defense Department immediately. If the allegations are not true, the Defense Department should be the very first to wish to clear its name.

I repeat that I have no personal knowledge because I have not been approached in any way. However, the rumors are very disturbing. For that reason I believe it would be in the national interest for the committee of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to delve into this question. If the allegations are unfounded, the investigation would be in the interests of the Defense Department itself.

I thank my colleague from Louisiana. Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without prejudice to my rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF A NEWSPAPER OWNER—TRIBUTE TO JOHN S. KNIGHT

Mr. SMATHERS. It is my pleasure to ask that unanimous consent be given to the insertion in the RECORD of a fine editorial which appeared initially in the Morgan County (Ohio) Herald and was later reprinted in the Miami Herald of January 29.

This editorial is devoted to one of the most outstanding journalistic personalities of our day—John S. Knight.

I think that I could do no better in describing this man than in quoting from the article which terms John Knight as an "idealist and truly American to the core." The article goes on to state that "we do not always agree with his conclusions, but he does fairly and logically and without partisan prejudice, present his viewpoint on great public issues in a way that inspires thought and confidence in the writer."

Mr. President, it is reassuring to know that men of Mr. Knight's caliber hold positions of such responsibility and influence. This article is a well-deserved tribute to a man who is a credit to the newspaper world and to our Nation. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEWSPAPER OWNER HAS OBLIGATIONS

For the past 12 months, it has been a privilege to read "The Editor's Notebook" in the Detroit Free Press. The "Notebook" is a column written each week by the editor and publisher, John S. Knight. Mr. Knight is one of America's foremost publishers. His vast holdings include the Akron Beacon Journal, the Free Press, Miami Herald, Charlotte Observer, and other important papers in the newspaper world.

As head of this huge newspaper empire, the responsibilities and business burdens of John S. Knight are heavy, indeed. He could easily divest himself of the chore of editorial writing by hiring others and depending upon the columnists. However, as was his father, Charles L. Knight, before him, the son is an idealist and soundly American to the core. It is a cardinal principle with him that not only does the owner of a newspaper have the obligation as such to print the events of the day but to interpret things of importance for his readers; in short to write editorials.

For 25 years, Mr. Knight has conducted his nationally known Notebook. We have read this with profit and pleasure. We do not always agree with his conclusions, but he does fairly and logically and without partisan prejudice, present his viewpoint on great public issues in a way that inspires thought and confidence in the writer.

In the final analysis, a democracy is what the majority of the people want it to be. If governmental affairs are soundly administered, it is because a majority of the people want it that way. Someway, after reading Mr. Knight's column during the past year, we have felt a sense of reassurance as to the function of the fourth estate in molding public opinion during a critical period of world history. There are still left, great editors and publishers, such as John S. Knight, among whom love for America and a deep sense of public duty are paramount and transcend the lure of the cash-box.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on Friday the Senate began its consideration of H.R. 11040, a bill to determine who shall own and operate a communications satellite system, which could have a revolutionary impact upon many other aspects of our lives. Since this area of space development is the first major fruit of our vast public expenditures, the decision we make here today and tomorrow will have far-reaching political and economic implications because they will create a precedent for later solutions in other areas of human activity in space.

Before we can make intelligent decisions, there are many questions to which we must find the answers. Among them are:

First. What are the uses and possibilities of a satellite communications system?

Second. Will ownership, control, or participation by existing international common carriers mean an extension of monopoly into a new technology or a new field?

Third. Has past experience shown whether regulation is an effective substitute for competition?

Fourth. To what extent can space, through the Government's more than \$25 billion investment in technology, be considered a public resource?

Fifth. Will control or ownership by the present communication carriers inhibit the realization of the maximum potential of this great new technology?

Sixth. Will control by industry provide us with the most efficient, economical, and advanced system available?

Seventh. Will the scale of private investment be adequate or commensurate with the public interest?

Eighth. To what extent will a civilian communications satellite system become an integral part of our defense system?

Ninth. Can private ownership fulfill the needs of our foreign policy?

Tenth. What will be the impact throughout the world if such an international communications system, sponsored and developed by the U.S. Government, is to be owned or controlled by either one large company or a group of a few large companies?

Let me say at the outset that I am not opposed to private ownership, eventually, of a communications satellite system. However, I am opposed to giving a satellite system or the right to establish one to any particular corporation before we know what we are doing, before we have it, and before we are in a position to assure ourselves that maximum competition for the benefit of the public will be available.

It is strongly my feeling that the commercial interests which are pressing the hardest—and I have in mind a single

large corporation at this point—to enact the pending bill at this time are seeking to obtain this vast asset, achieved at a \$25 billion Government investment, prior to the time that the people know what it is all about, on the theory that it is much easier to get this enormous asset, with its fantastic possibilities for the future, before the public knows what it is, before it has even been established, before we have it in operation, than it would be in a year or in 2 or 3 years, after we had had an opportunity to study the matter and to have answers to some of the questions that I have posed, which should be answered in the event that such legislation is to be passed.

Therefore, I am not speaking for public ownership. I am simply saying that we should not give this asset away before we know what it is, and before we are in a position to assure ourselves that the terms under which it is to be given away are those which are calculated to be best for the overall benefit of the 185 million people in the United States and, indeed, for the billions of the people in the world.

These are but a few of the many difficult problems we must consider. We must analyze all available facts in an objective, unbiased, and dispassionate manner. All the facts and the issues must be known and understood both by the Congress and by the citizenry before constructive legislation can be considered.

Instead, what do we find? Because of an almost complete blackout by newspapers, radio, and television, our citizens are not aware of the great public issues involved. I doubt if my colleagues in the Senate could pass even an elementary examination in the subject matter and its implications.

Instead of objective, unbiased information, we have been bombarded and almost overwhelmed with clichés, slogans, half-truths, and misinformation provided by special interest groups. We have been subjected to lobbying activity the like of which the Congress has not seen recently.

This bill before us today embodies some of the most important policy considerations which the Congress will have considered for a long time to come. Its consequences will be felt for generations. The decisions we make will be difficult to reverse, and I cannot think of a greater violation of the public interest than to try to rush this bill through in this session of the Congress.

I intend to subject this legislation to the closest scrutiny, and I propose to lay the issues—stripped of the clichés and slogans—before the Congress and the American people.

II. POTENTIALITIES OF A SATELLITE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

It is essential for the interests of the country that we thoroughly understand what can be done before the decisions are made as to just how we will use this major achievement in space that we have. I do not think there is any question at this time of the fact that we have a major achievement. I think there may be some question as to the extent of what it is. But, certainly, there is no

real issue at the moment but that satellite systems provide an opportunity to form new methods or new services in the area of communications; new services to handle weather forecasting, to anticipate disasters and other opportunities of that sort.

Certainly, this provides a new and significantly better way of providing navigational information to all kinds of vessels. It conceivably can provide the opportunity for global broadcasting, the opportunity for mass communication between peoples of the world, the like of which we had not dreamed of even 5 years ago.

And, finally, it gives us the opportunity now to think in terms of inspection systems that will let us know what the intentions of our neighbor or our neighboring nations are to us, and will, for the first time, perhaps, begin to give us as a practical matter an opportunity to have some information on which we can rely, that will tell us whether or not we are in danger of being clobbered, if I may use the word.

These are possibilities that we see in this scientific achievement. There is, of course, still a substantial amount of engineering and development work to be done, and there is no question about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Unfortunately I came into the Chamber only a moment or two ago. Therefore perhaps the Senator from Louisiana has already given the answer to the question I should like to address to him. If the pending bill were to become law now and the corporation were to be organized promptly, so as to be established by September 1 of this year, for example, could we then expect immediate communication by satellite?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; it would be in merely an experimental stage for the next 2 years.

Mr. BARTLETT. For the next 2 years?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. We would be in a position during some time short of that period to have a certain amount of communication on a test basis; but so far as any reliable basis is concerned, it would be 2 years, according to the best information we have, before it could be expected to have reliable service, even if the bill were to be passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana was the chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business which held extensive hearings on this subject?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I conducted hearings for the Committee on Small Business. The hearings were conducted over a period of about 8 days, during which the subcommittee examined rather thoroughly into the proposal, considering the time which was available to us. I believe our hearings actually were longer, so far as concerns actual testimony taken, than were the hearings conducted by the legislative committees on the subject.

Mr. BARTLETT. From the testimony which the Senator heard, which of the two systems which he has described would be initiated by the private carriers—the new corporation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall come to that a little later in my address. However, there are proposals for a low-altitude system, which would comprise satellites orbiting at about 6,000 miles, and for a synchronous orbiting system, which would have satellites orbiting at a distance of 22,290 miles above the earth.

As I attempted to spell out previously, when I first discussed the proposal, in my judgment if we are really trying to go the free enterprise route and establish effective competition for existing services, so as to insure the maximum benefit and competition, it would not be desirable to have the corporation embark upon the low-altitude system. There is serious doubt in my mind that that system should be used for anything more than experimental purposes, because the synchronous system could be in full operation almost as soon as, and perhaps sooner than, the low-orbit system; and it would cost much less and provide a much superior service.

To try to give some basis of comparison, I should say the probabilities are that a synchronous system would cost 10 percent as much and would provide two or three times better service than if a low-altitude system were to be used. It seems to me that most private enterprise operators would not be interested in the low-altitude system unless they were prepared to go into it on a regulated utility basis, which would enable them to get their money back from someone else.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it the Senator's conclusion that even if a start were made on a low-altitude system, sooner or later it would be necessary, for a very good reason, to go to the high-altitude system?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is completely correct; because when we get into the details, we see how impractical the low-altitude system is. It is a system which could perhaps be made workable, but it would involve a high operational cost. It would require much more equipment and fantastically greater investment, and would entail greater operational difficulties than would a synchronous system. One could say that it would really serve very little purpose to establish a global communications system, using the low-orbital system, which I understand is what is being proposed and what will be attempted if the bill is passed in its present form. In my judgment, it is a mistake to try to put private enterprise into that type of operation, for it will not be a good system in any event.

Mr. BARTLETT. As the Senator from Louisiana may know, I joined with the senior Senator from Texas in presenting minority views from the Committee on Commerce on the proposal. In connection with what the Senator from Louisiana has said, I should like to quote from the minority views. Senator KEFAUVER had asked a question of a vice president of Western Union Telegraph Co.

Senator KEFAUVER. Suppose you had a corporation of \$200 million right now. What would it do with the money?

Mr. BARR. Well, for an appreciable period of time, it would sit on its hands. Deferral of this legislation until next year will not delay the development of a space satellite communications system in any degree.

In light of that statement, I renew the question I earlier asked of the Senator: Does he know of any good reason why, in June 1962, Congress should rush this bill to passage?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, I do not know of any good reason why that should be done. Actually, the important thing is that the Nation should proceed as rapidly as it has been proceeding to overcome the technological and engineering problems involved in placing such a system into operation. As I said on Friday, the Government can always give the system away any time it wishes to do so. The easiest thing to do is to give it away. As the Senator from Alaska knows, someone is always willing to take something of value if the Government is in a position to give it away.

As of this time, the Nation cannot afford to entrust to a private corporation matters which are important to the foreign policy and the survival of the country.

So far as being first in space with a communications system is concerned, it is important that the United States be there, whether on a private enterprise basis or on a Government basis. So long as the Government continues to support the project and do the research and development work, it will be in a position to insure that the system will not fail because of a lack of financing, so long as Congress is willing to vote the appropriations. Thus far, I think the Senator from Alaska will agree with me, Congress has been willing to vote whatever money was necessary to catch up with the Russians and get ahead of them in the development and exploration of outer space.

Mr. BARTLETT. There has been no congressional lag in that respect. I do not recall the Senate ever refusing to vote every cent requested; in some cases, I believe it has given more than the amount in the budget items.

With respect to the Senator's statement about the implications in our foreign policy, I am very much concerned about one section of the bill which, as now written, provides that the corporation to be formed under the bill may be comprised partly of private carriers and partly of public representatives, and partly of representatives appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The corporation, in respect of foreign matters, is obliged only to notify the Department of State of the negotiations. The original language was much more demanding and provided:

All agreements and arrangements with any such agency, government, or entity shall be subject to the approval of the Department of State.

I should think, in any case, that the language which provides that the corporation merely has to notify the Department of State is altogether unacceptable,

because it places the private corporation in a role where it can make U.S. foreign policy. I feel certain that the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that that goes much too far.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator from Alaska. So far as I know, it is unprecedented that the U.S. Government would license a private corporation to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States, and to a considerable degree complete that undertaking and put the President, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the State Department to work for the privately owned corporation.

The bill is necessary if the particular communications common carriers are to be able to participate in the effort; otherwise, they would be in direct violation of the antitrust laws, which prohibit monopolistic concerns from pooling together in a joint undertaking, because they further tend to strengthen the combine and the mutual activities among the concerns. This tends to eliminate competition even more between the companies.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Louisiana has already said that the carriers or the Government or both of them together or anyone else who might be brought in would use the work already done to initiate the satellite communications system, and the Senator from Louisiana has also said that much further experimental work—costing no one knows how much—will be required; and billions of dollars have already been spent on it. If that is the case, does the Senator from Louisiana know whether the corporation which would be formed would put up all the additional money required for the further experimentation, or would the Federal Government be obliged to continue to make these contributions?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Webb, in testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, was asked a similar question—in other words, whether NASA expected to continue its research and development in that field. He replied:

Yes, sir. It is contemplated that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will continue to do active research and development on the technology involved in using communications satellites and the tie-in with communications satellite systems.

So it is contemplated that the Government will work for this corporation, in providing further research and development for this purpose, even after the corporation gains control.

And, as shown on page 624, Mr. Webb also said:

But also we will have a lot of measuring devices on this satellite that will measure the flux, the field, the radiation, and all of the other factors of the environment through which this will fly. Now, all of that information will come back to us, and will be analyzed.

It will then go to the companies who are in the field, so that every company that has a need to know this information will have available all of it which is derived from the relay program.

This is a service to all the industry, and is broader than the research that one company would do and would utilize for its own purposes.

So we see that the Government would continue to do a great portion of this work, although the Government would not have any prospect of sharing in the profits, but would only provide this service to the corporation.

Mr. BARTLETT. The remarks of the Senator from Louisiana are in harmony with the minority views, in which it is stated:

Even if a decision were made to place ownership and control of this country's satellite communications system in a private monopoly, the Government would necessarily continue to have its leading role. The Government would be required to:

- (1) Furnish launch vehicles.
- (2) Launch the satellites and provide launch crew and associated services.
- (3) Consult with the private corporation regarding technical specifications for satellites and ground stations and in determining the number and location of such facilities.

And to do many other things which would be essential.

If this program is to have the success we hope and believe it will have, all that must be done.

Likewise, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. John H. Rubel, told the Senate Space Committee that about 90 percent of the problem involved here has nothing to do with communications as such, but that it is rather a byproduct or an extra dividend, as it were.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that that is the best I can determine from the lobbying activities with which I have become acquainted. I do not criticize anyone for lobbying in favor of the passage of a bill which will benefit his corporation; I believe that to be his privilege under the Constitution. But the best I can determine from the persons who have contacted me—I refer to persons representing commercial interests—is that only one corporation is interested in this matter, and that is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which, through its subsidiaries, owns over 90 percent of all the telephone equipment in this country.

There are many possibilities that we can see in connection with this bill, and no doubt many of them would happen if the bill were enacted into law. I believe many such possibilities would be in the direction of tightening the monopolistic grip of this one corporation on the future control and use of the system.

As I pointed out on Friday, it would actually be to the advantage of the company that the system not be profitable for a number of years to come; and I submit that the low altitude system which I have described, and which I shall describe at greater length later on, presents the possibility of losing \$400 million or \$500 million very easily. So it is not something that a good businessman would want to be a part of. But this bill would make it possible for this company for years to come to have its cake and to eat it, too—as a result of the loans and the Government assistance it would be able to receive. The company could very easily lose a great deal of money in

the process, but as a result of the procedure to which I have referred it would be able to tighten its control and would have a greater equity in this matter than it would have if the Government proceeded to experiment and develop the communications system.

Of course, my personal feeling is that the Government should go directly to the central orbit system; and I predict that the Russians will do that if they wish to have a communications satellite system, instead of having these low-orbit satellites. Instead, the Russians would place one at the proper distance in space, so that it would remain at a fixed point in the sky, which, if a telephone microwave system were used, would be 22,500 miles high.

Mr. BARTLETT. As I recall, on Friday the Senator from Louisiana said there might be a situation in which a private carrier, a member of the corporation, would suffer great losses, but would be able to recoup them, while the period of loss persisted, by services performed in connection with more conventional methods. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me give an illustration: The bill would permit this corporation to borrow money from the Bell Telephone System, and the money it borrowed could be included in the rate base of that system. Suppose that in pursuance of the terms of the bill the corporation borrowed \$500 million from the Bell Telephone System, which is one system, regardless of whether it is called Southern Bell or Pacific Bell Telephone or Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. or any of the other 18 names this corporation goes under. If it borrowed that money and if the whole thing proved to be impractical and just a bunch of junk, the bill would still permit Bell to put that investment into its rate base, and thus it would be in a position to make a return of at least 6½ percent—much better than the return on a Government bond. So even if the communications satellite system failed completely, Bell would still be in a position to make 6½-percent return on its other services. In other words, it would be able to make more money than it would otherwise be entitled to make, and to get back everything it lost, plus a 6½-percent return for having loaned the money to the corporation.

That would be a pretty good arrangement of "heads I win, tails you lose," compared to a private investment. These telephone companies would only have to advance their money; and even if the satellite system proved to be commercially impractical and did not actually make money, the telephone users would be charged a rate high enough to enable the Bell System to get back its money, plus a profit of 6½ percent, in addition.

Mr. BARTLETT. So the Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that the housewife would both figuratively and literally have to take up the slack.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is entirely correct. Furthermore, it would actually be to the immediate profit advantage of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in connection with its great economic power and control over this

matter, to see to it that the system did not make money for many years to come.

I do not know whether the Senator has had an opportunity to discuss the matter with representatives of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I have. It took me a long time before I decided my position. They have discussed this matter with me. They told me it will probably take a great many years before the company could make money; that if the system went out of order, people could not be sent there to fix it. All of which leads me to ask, if it is so bad, why do they want it? I think the answer is that it might be a future system of communications far superior to the services they are presently providing. If that is so, they want to be sure that they have control of it, so it does not outrace them in the future.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Senator will agree that few situations could be found where companies could go into this field with the Government ready, willing, and, we hope, able, to pay a continuing bill for development.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There are all sorts of ways in which the bill makes it possible for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to gain control of what could be a great potential competitor with its existing services. There is quite a bit of language in the bill which on its face appears to seek to prevent that result. I would not doubt the good intentions of those who put that language in the bill, but when one recognizes what the facts of life are in this field, he will recognize that the suggestions about effective competition can be circumvented by the control the corporation can achieve over the satellite corporation. He will find this still is a bill that he would expect this giant corporation to be pressing and promoting.

So far as the Justice Department and the committee's having spoken in favor of competition is concerned, I believe it will be found that the greatest of the world monopolies at this time would still think that it had better take this bill, even with these limitations in it, rather than let Congress study this proposal and put more limitations in the bill and do what should be done to provide that there shall be effective competition between satellite communications and existing communications.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator has asked me if I have been lobbied on this bill. My answer is, "No, I have not been." On one occasion, and only one occasion, some months ago, I had an opportunity to have luncheon with a representative of the A.T. & T. He simply sought on that occasion—and it was a long while ago—to explain the company's position, and it did not go further.

If the Senator will allow me to say, I note the minority views—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I interrupt the Senator to ask a question? I believe his answer was clear, but has any other company contacted the Senator about this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. The answer is in the negative.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I have in mind is that with all the talk about free enterprise, it is good to keep

in mind who it is that wants this arrangement. No other corporation in this country has suggested to me it felt this was a bill we should pass and that it would be in on it and that it thought it would be a fine thing. There is just this one company that is interested. Frankly, I invite any company who believes this is a good bill to express itself on it. It is its privilege under the Constitution.

Mr. BARTLETT. The RCA people and the Western Union people have not come in to see me. No private carrier except A.T. & T. did, and I have explained that was on one occasion only. I certainly would not call that lobbying, if that is the right word to use here.

Of course, I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Louisiana that Members of the Senate are better educated if they have the views of interested individuals and concerns on any legislative proposition. We welcome that sort of thing.

As I was going to say, the minority views suggest that the stock price to the public should be placed at not more than \$10, instead of the \$100 provided in the bill, but assuredly not more than \$25.

Upon reflection, I do not know that I would agree with that suggestion, although I signed the report, because, on afterthought, my view is that such a provision might be an indication for the little fellow to get into it, and I do not think he should come into it and gamble with his money, for two reasons: First, it may be a long time, as the Senator has suggested, before this enterprise will be profitable. Second, I cannot, for the life of me, see how the public is going to have any effective control over the destinies of this corporation, private though it may be in name and practice, because the larger stockholders are going to dominate it, and the fellow who has \$1,000 invested is going to have very little to say about how the corporation shall be run, any more than he does in regard to General Motors, or Sears, Roebuck, or A.T. & T., or any of the other big companies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, there is much merit in the suggestion of the Senator. So far as control of the corporation is concerned, it has been testified many times than one owning as much as 5 percent of the stock of a publicly held corporation whose stock is widely scattered can control that corporation. In this case, as the Senator knows, under the bill, 50 percent of the stock would be set aside for the so-called communications common carriers. Assuming a large amount of money was necessary to put the company into operation, there is only one company that could put up a great amount of money, and that is American Telephone & Telegraph Co., with the result that the corporation would be in a position to have a vast amount of power.

Three of the directors of the corporation are to be named by the President. That provision causes me to ask some questions, too. When in a private corporation there are public members of the board, for whom are those public members supposed to speak? The United States or the stockholders? Ordinarily,

the directors speak out in favor of the best interests of the company. What are the considerations to be when the President appoints three directors to the board?

How do we know, for all intents and purposes, that one or two of these giant corporations might not have enough influence throughout Government to see that one of its men was named?

Furthermore, if it is up to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., for example, to say who the other directors shall be on the board to constitute a majority, while there is a prohibition, I assume, against any one of their officers being on the board, that prohibition would not apply to stockholders in American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and directors of the satellite corporation who owned stock in American Telephone & Telegraph Co. might vote for interests parallel with those of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The result might be that control would be achieved, certainly of a majority of the directors. Such an occurrence would be at complete variance with the policy Congress adopted when it provided that a railroad could not own a water carrier. The Civil Aeronautics Board has been reluctant to permit a railroad to own an airline. The policies of the Government have made it impossible for a railroad or water carrier to own a commercial busline or trucking line in this country.

The fact that this policy was pursued has caused the most rapid development, and has resulted in the most effective competition which each of these carriers could provide.

We have observed, in the history of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., that company has repeatedly attempted, insofar as it could, to prevent the development of new communication services outside this corporation, whether they were telegraph lines, teletype lines, television cables, microwave transmission, or anything else. This corporation has undertaken, insofar as it possibly could, to completely control every phase of communications.

That is what is involved in the pending bill. If this program gets beyond the control of the corporation, there might be actual and effective competition between existing methods of communications and space methods of communications, which could be authorized by use of satellites.

Mr. BARTLETT. What the Senator has said proves conclusively, in my opinion, that we are seeking to chart new skyways not only in respect to communications, but also in respect to corporate structure. It is so novel and so new that we find difficulty in comprehending it. We do not know how it will work out.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me, as he has. If he will permit me to do so, I wish to say further, before allowing him to resume his formal speech, that I resist and even resent implications which have been made by some uninformed people that my friend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [PASTORE], and those associated with him—who

constitute, as we know, a majority in the Committee on Commerce, in which committee there were only two dissenting Senators—are involved in any way in a giveaway program.

The Senator from Rhode Island said on Friday that he is willing to stand on his record in behalf of consumers over his many and effective years in public life. I wish to certify that I have some knowledge in that regard myself. I could not agree more wholeheartedly. Of course he and the other Senators who are advocates of the bill are not involved in any giveaway program. They believe, as all of us do, that the free enterprise system is appropriate for this particular purpose. Some of us have a feeling—at least I do—that while we have absolute dedication and devotion to the free enterprise system, the satellite communications system is so new and so untried, the returns from it are possibly so great, with so much yet remaining to be done—all the work so far, practically, has been done by the Government—that the Government should have control for a period of time, at least until the bugs are worked out, until we can see where we are going, and why.

As the vice president of Western Union Telegraph Co. told the senior Senator from Tennessee, there is no need to hurry now. Nothing will be accomplished by passing the bill this year. As the Senator from Louisiana has explained to me, not once but twice, it will be at least 2 years before the satellite communications system can be put into use and can be effective. If that is the case—and I know it is, from what the Senator said—why do we not wait? Why do we not see which way the program will develop?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point is that we can always give the system away to any particular corporation to which we wish to give it. We should be taking care to see that when it is disposed of or placed in private hands it will be placed in private hands for the best interests of all the people of this Nation.

I should like to give to the Senator a simple reason why this is true.

I am advised by some of the people who work for the Hughes Aircraft Co., which has a contract to build the capsule which would be used for the synchronous orbit communications satellite, that in their best judgment, they should be able to have a synchronous satellite in orbit within 2 years. They feel the system could have 1,200 circuits. With a total of 1,200 circuits, they think with only 40 in full use they ought to be making money; and that is based on the assumption that the rate to be charged for overseas calls would be 50 percent of the rate which is now being charged for telephone calls overseas, with perhaps a lower rate than is presently being charged for many long distance domestic calls, such as calls to Alaska and places like that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. It would be well if the rates went down a bit on those calls.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us face the problem. A.T. & T. presently has

the cables under the sea. As I understand that situation, there are about 64 channels in those cables. Such a corporation would not wish to cut its rate in half. If its competitor should put the rate at one-half, it would be necessary to drop the rate even though the volume were not sufficient to offset expenses, thus possibly causing losses for the corporation. That is how competition works.

As the Senator knows, we do not guarantee the railroads will make a profit on the transportation of persons. We do not guarantee that the airlines will make a profit on the transportation of persons. Some of the smaller airlines are subsidized, but the bigger ones are willing to compete with each other and to compete with the surface carriers. They are regulated as to the amount of the profit which they can make, being limited to a fair return, but they are not guaranteed the profit. That is why they are permitted to make a rate of profit which is substantially more than would be true if one were considering only Government bonds or some sort of very safe security such as corporate bonds.

Now we see the prospect for a great competitive service to the leading existing communications common carrier. The bill before us is designed to prevent that competitive situation from developing.

There are some good features in the bill. However, I am compelled to say, for the reasons I have stated, when we consider what competition can mean for the public good we can see how it could well be to the advantage not merely of A.T. & T. but also of the smaller communications carriers as well to retard the development of this new service, with the lower rates it could bring.

From the public point of view, it would be well to see that the lower rates were available to the public at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to ask the Senator if the Hughes Tool Co. people were able to indicate to him how many of these channels could be put into full use in the first year or two after the system is placed in operation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding is that they figure that when the satellite with 1,200 channels is put into orbit, they would be in a position to use the entire 1,200 channels, but even if they had only enough business to make full use of 3 or 4 percent of the capacity in the satellite, at rates half the existing rates, they would be making money.

That compares to the kind of thing A.T. & T. wants to take the Government into in the low-orbit system. I would say that that would appear to be a rat-hole for the investment of public or private money. It would require untold numbers of satellites. I understand it would require 40 satellites in orbit, for example, to assure enough orbiting around the earth to maintain a constant communication between the United States and Europe. In order to have worldwide coverage, I understand there would be a requirement for about 400 satellites in orbit.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the Senator to repeat his figure? How many satellites would be required for communications between the United States and Europe?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. About 40.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did not the Senator say on Friday that one of the high-altitude satellites would cover 92 percent of the portion of the world which has effective use of long-distance communications now?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A single synchronous satellite placed in orbit directly above the equator at about 22° west longitude, which would be about midway between Africa and South America, would tend to remain in the same position in the sky. It would travel at a speed of roughly 7,000 miles an hour; and with the earth turning at the rate of about 1,000 miles an hour, the satellite would appear to be exactly overhead at all times if one were at that particular point on the earth.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would the satellite be visible to the naked eye?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, because it would be too small. However, the satellite could be seen by radar. If it were visible, it would appear to be exactly overhead. If one were looking at the satellite from our country, it would always appear to be toward the southeast. It would be at exactly the same spot in the heavens at all times, 24 hours in the day.

Having the satellite in such a position would bring about the same result, so far as concerns sending and receiving signals, that we would have with a television or microwave tower 22,290 miles high.

With the globe which I have in my hand representing the earth, I believe I can demonstrate the situation to the Senator. I point out a tiny dot at the top of a cone which I hold in my other hand. If that tiny dot should represent a satellite placed in orbit at a distance of 22,290 miles over the earth, being exactly over the position of 22° west longitude, it would be in the position I am now indicating.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At that point it would be in such a position that a signal could be sent to and received from the satellite so that 92 percent of all the telephone calls of the telephone users in the world could be relayed. With that single satellite those calls could be relayed 24 hours a day, and the satellite would remain in that position for years.

Mr. BARTLETT. Obviously the Senator from Louisiana is much better informed than I am on the technicalities involved. Would much time be consumed in sending a signal to the satellite and having it relayed to wherever it might be destined to go?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would take about one-half second from the time one would speak into an instrument until that person's voice was heard at the other end. That brief period of time is not significant in the average telephone conversation. If the Senator were required to pay only half as much for the service as it presently costs, I be-

lieve he would be glad to put up with that slight degree of difference in getting his call through.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is fairly rapid.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would be one-half second from the time the signal was sent at one end until it would be received at the other end.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The testimony also indicated that the small technical disadvantage about which the Senator has spoken is now being worked upon. It was thought that the difficulties could be ironed out, that there would not be any delay in the sending and receiving of the voice. The testimony indicated that the slight carryback that might come from that three-tenths of a second delay in receiving the voice was a point that could be solved scientifically so that the difficulty would be removed. That was the testimony of the Hughes representatives. They seemed to know what they were talking about.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct when he speaks of three-tenths of a second. The president of RCA testified:

There is a question whether that would be objectionable to the telephone call. This time interval has no significance for television, record, or nonvoice services.

I point out that the satellite could be used to relay radio broadcasts and eventually television broadcasts. The president of RCA said that it would be a matter of opinion whether the delay would be objectionable to a television user. Many telephone engineers consider the delay to be unimportant.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with him. I hope that the technical advances suggested by the Senator from Tennessee are not made, because even now, as we know, at times the person being called is at the other end of the line before we want him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I illustrate to the Senator by placing the cone which I hold in my hand in a certain position. As the earth turned, the satellite would move at a more rapid rate, but at a rate which would match the rate at which the earth turns. As a result, the satellite would be in the same position in the heavens relative to any given point on earth at all times, 24 hours a day.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would it really be in the same position or would it only appear to be in the same relative position?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The whole thing is relative. The satellite would be in the same relative position at all times. There are advantages to constructing a system in that way. If the system were constructed in that way, those who have advised me on the subject have said there is no reason why the system could not show a profit in the first year.

If the low-altitude orbital system were adopted, by which great numbers of satellites would be put into orbit, it might be 2 years before all the satellites were in position in the heavens, because such satellites could be launched into orbit only at a certain rate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Am I correct in my assumption that a satellite, whether it be a low-altitude or a high-altitude satellite, must be tracked?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under the synchronous system a satellite need not be tracked. I will illustrate by the use of a diagram in the rear of the Chamber. A fixed antenna, aimed at one precise point in the heavens—

Mr. BARTLETT. Is the Senator referring to the chart that is entitled "Single Fixed Antenna"?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. For example, to receive a great number of channels, the receiving disc would be about 82 feet wide. It would be aimed at a single point in the heavens, at which point the satellite would be located. The antenna could be constructed in concrete at that point, if need be, because instead of moving the antenna to track the satellite, the satellite itself would be moved if it got out of the beam of the antenna.

In other words, certain equipment would be placed in the satellite to give it a certain amount of mobility, so that it would be slowed down, or moved a little closer or moved farther back in order to keep it in orbit at exactly the point desired. The result is that the satellite could be parked in front of the antenna, and if the satellite drifted away, it could be moved to the point where it would be in front of the beam of the antenna.

Such a receiving system as the one described would cost less than 2 percent of what it would cost to do the same kind of job with the multiple-tracking antenna that A.T. & T. plans to put into operation at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Less than 2 percent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Less than 2 percent; yes. The project that A.T. & T. has in mind calls for 40 to 50 satellites, or perhaps 400 satellites, moving around in the heavens. The antennae would weigh a great amount. My understanding is that an antenna system built in Maine weighs more than 300 tons. It is mounted on rails and is built to a precision of one-thousandth of an inch. The whole structure is mounted on a cradle so it can be tilted with great accuracy and remain precisely focused on a satellite as it passes overhead.

Even with all that equipment and with all the technical problems involved, the antenna would be able to switch onto a satellite for only 6 to 10 minutes while it was passing between two points—for example, between the United States and Europe. So it could be in communication with only one other point on earth at the same time.

If a multiple-tracking system were to be used, the technicians would have to switch back and forth from one satellite to another. As one satellite disappeared, another would have to be picked up. As a result, radar antenna would be required to search the skies in order to find another satellite. It could not be seen but would have to be searched for by radar. A second 300-ton antenna would be mounted on the principle of a ship mounted on the top of a knife edge,

swinging around endeavoring to find another satellite coming through and trying to track that one. With all the complications involved, a device of intricate precision would be required; and should any of the moving mechanism fail in the slightest degree, the result would be the failure of a very large investment running into many millions of dollars to do a much less satisfactory job than a system that would cost approximately \$600,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the Senator a question at this point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. With the necessity of the low-altitude system antenna tracking one satellite and then another during an 8- or 10-minute period, while the satellite is in the range of a particular ground station, would that not require also, if it is going to be of any use to other nations that those nations have a similar tracking system?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So there would be involved a tremendous expense in connection with this elaborate and expensive kind of ground system, because some nations would not be able to afford it. Therefore, how are they going to know when we switch from one satellite to another? Will they not have to switch at the same time in order to have any continuity whatever in the television or the telephone message that is being transmitted? Was that not brought out by the testimony before the committees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The best information I have on the subject is that a single one of these multiple tracking horns of the proposed tracking antenna would cost \$3,500,000. There would have to be at least three of them in one place in order to communicate effectively.

Mr. BARTLETT. With what?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With some other point. As the satellite is out in space and we wished to communicate between the United States and Western Europe, for example, we could communicate for 10 minutes while that satellite was passing from the North Pole to the South Pole, between those two points. That satellite would be in position for 10 minutes. Then it would pass below the horizon. It would then be necessary to wait for hours before we could continue the conversation through that particular satellite. That being the case, it would be necessary to have 40 of these in orbit, between the United States and Europe, in order to carry on a continuous conversation. It would be possible to switch from one to another to track it across the horizon, and a person on the other side would have to have the same equipment, of course.

One would not be able to switch over from one star to another with that fine accuracy that would be required using only one tracking antenna, so, therefore, it would be necessary to have an antenna training on the second satellite while the other one was still following the first satellite. As I say, so much equipment would be involved, and it would be so complicated, that it would be necessary to have a spare standing by in the event

one of them should develop some difficulty.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mention has been made of the cost which would be involved to our Nation and to underdeveloped nations, where the President wants this to be used also, and where it would have to be used, if it were to be of any use to the world. The Air Force has proposed to lease or rent two portable tracking stations for the A.T. & T. Telstar. The price is mentioned as \$475,000 a year. That is not for the purchase of it. That is merely the rental price. I do not know whether this is an additional consideration, plus the consideration that A.T. & T. have a part in the joint control of information coming from the program. So if it is to succeed at all, it will be very expensive, and very few nations of the world will be able to afford a rental cost of that kind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My best understanding is that to use a multiple-tracking antenna a nation should anticipate that it would have to spend \$10 million in order to have enough tracking facilities to merely reach one point on the other side; that is, between this Nation and Europe. Therefore, to use the satellite it would mean a \$10 million investment here in order to match \$10 million on the other side. That is just the tracking antenna. Then it would be necessary to have 40 satellites. That involves a great deal of money. That would be only two points; for example, between the United States and Western Europe. Senators can imagine the problem that would confront a developing nation like Ghana or Nigeria, or any other developing nation, in its attempt to find skilled personnel who would be able to operate one of these multiple tracking stations. I doubt that such a nation could find the skilled personnel, even if it could afford the equipment, or even if we gave the equipment to it under some kind of lend-lease arrangement. On the other hand, the single, fixed antenna, to which I have referred, as a part of the synchronous system, could simply be set up and zeroed in against the right point in the heavens, and could be used at all times.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did the Senator say early in his address that to provide complete coverage with the low-altitude satellites, over 400 would be required?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is my understanding; in order to provide worldwide coverage it would take about 400 satellites.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does that mean that to keep track of these 400-plus satellites, it would be necessary to have an identical number of the multiple-tracking stations?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There would have to be a multiple-tracking antenna in each vicinity that wanted to communicate. Of course, one antenna could communicate only with one satellite at a time.

Mr. BARTLETT. One for one. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. If we wished to communicate between the United States and Europe, it would be possible to communicate through several channels, perhaps, but that would be only between two points on the earth, such as between the United States and Western Europe. While we were communicating in that area, that same tracking antenna could not be used to communicate between this part of the United States and Alaska. Another satellite would have to be used for that purpose, and another tracking antenna would have to be used.

The Senator can see the fantastic investment that would have to be made in trying to merely establish the low-altitude system. After the whole thing was out there in space, we would probably find that it was already obsolete, because by that time someone probably would have placed the synchronous system into orbit at the right position in space.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did the Senator hear any testimony, assuming that we are ready with this system in 2 years, that any other nation will be ready to receive our transmissions?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should imagine that at the time that we were able to put the synchronous system into orbit we would be able to have the receiving stations in position in other countries. I am now speaking of the synchronous system. As to the low-altitude system, that is rather doubtful. This is what Dr. Trotter had to say on that point:

A random-orbit system could discredit us before the world as a leader in space communications if Russia establishes a stationary satellite system. If the United States went ahead with a low-random orbit system it would be possible for Russia to hold back until we were deeply committed to this system and had launched perhaps two-thirds of the satellites and then with three satellites the Russians could establish a truly worldwide system before our limited system was even in operation.

Mr. BARTLETT. Whatever the need for improved communications may be at this time, whether they come from satellites or from any other methods, is it not true, in the Senator's judgment, that this will be increased tremendously during the next 50 years, for two basic reasons: First, in the new nations which are now coming into being the people will become educated in these matters and they will want to join in it. Secondly, if the statisticians are correct, the world's population will increase by hundreds of millions in the next 50 years. I will not project it further into the future. Whatever is done now, therefore, will have a bearing upon the pattern for a long time to come. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

I might point out also, in discussing the relative merits of the systems, that we must keep in mind that even if the low altitude system should prove to be a fantastic money loser, without any prospect of ever showing a profit, it would still be to the advantage of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to go into it, because they could do much of this

work by lending the money and being guaranteed a return on their investment, even though the entire venture failed—I mean being guaranteed to the extent that they could charge it off to telephone users for intrastate or interstate long-distance telephone calls.

Then, having driven out the little investors, the shoe clerks, they could wait until such time as the synchronous system was instituted to gain full control of this company and have it under whatever kind of operational control they would want to have.

Mr. BARTLETT. So the Senator from Louisiana finds it impossible, for all the reasons he has named, plus many more that he will cite before he ends his speech, to support the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that before the bill is passed, it should be drastically amended if it is desired to encourage the public to buy stock. We should try to amend the bill in such a way that people will not be the victims of loss operations to the ultimate benefit of such a large corporation; or amend it in such a way that the operation will make money in short order. That could be done by the synchronous system, not by the low-altitude system. Even if the low-orbit operation succeeded at all, the rates would hardly be any cheaper than the present rates. The operation would be experimental, in all probability.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Where in the bill is there any indication at all as to what system will be adopted by the corporation? Will the Senator point that out to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It does not say in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it does not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator will develop whether the proposal is to be for a low-orbit system as an initial undertaking in space communications. An effort should be made to go into the synchronous system if there is to be profitable operations. Has the Senator undertaken to determine whether that would be the case?

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the point at all. The Senator from Rhode Island never undertook to do that, because he does not pretend to be an expert scientist or engineer. Actually, at this very moment, I do not believe anybody knows which system will be the final answer. But the implication has been left by the Senator from Louisiana this afternoon that the A.T. & T. is deliberately embarking upon a system which is the "bunk," and will lead to the spending of a large sum of money and which money will go down the drain. That is the point the Senator from Louisiana is making this afternoon. I think that is rather frivolous; actually, it is fantastic. Furthermore, under the bill, before the company can undertake any kind of system, it must go before the FCC.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I were the Senator, and under the bill I were proposing to authorize someone to put a satellite system in orbit, I would like to know which system he was selling. If I

were to pay the bill to give somebody a satellite system, I would like to know whether it was to be a synchronous system or a low-orbit system.

Mr. PASTORE. Why so? Suppose it proves that the low-orbit system is the true system. What if a high-orbit system is not successful? What qualification has the Senator from Louisiana to tell the people of the country, scientifically, the kind of system which ought to be in orbit?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Rhode Island want to give the system to the corporation before he knows what it is to be?

Mr. PASTORE. I am not giving anybody anything. I am merely saying that the President of the United States has suggested the proposed legislation, so that we may get on with the job of doing what needs to be done. That is why we are here. We are determining what we should do. If the Senator from Louisiana is telling me that we ought to determine in the first year what ought to be done, I think we would be wasting time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think it would be a fine idea to determine what to do.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean we ought to find out first what the perfect system is before a corporation is created, that we ought to spend the taxpayers' money to develop a system for the benefit of people who want to make a call to Paris, France, and then give the system away? I say we should not throw away the taxpayers' money. Let the companies which are interested in the project put up their own money and determine the kind of system which ought to be used. If the Senate is really interested in the taxpayers, this is the way to proceed.

The President of the United States has suggested that this should be done. Some of these proposals are being made by persons who are not practical, who may not be expert, but are coming before the Senate, saying that we ought to have low-altitude or high-altitude systems. They are pretending to know too much without sufficient experience based on experimentation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not seeking to wrap the President in the bill or to wrap the bill around him. I think the bill should stand on its own merits. I know who was pushing for the bill, trying to get a bill, long before the President of the United States ever sent a message to Congress. I know about the organization of the so-called advisory committee, which was composed of and limited to communications common carriers. It is about the same as putting a fox in charge of protecting the henhouse. Here we see those people coming in with a bill which they are seeking to have passed. So we know where the pressure is and who has been trying to have the bill passed. We can analyze what has happened and see what is likely to happen. I am very much interested in knowing what will happen if the bill shall be passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will wait for a moment. The Senator says he does not wish to have the taxpayers contribute money which private enterprise can provide. Whom do we think we are kidding? The A.T. & T. can make a loan, and for every nickel they put into the program, they are entitled to get every nickel back plus a 6-percent return on their investment.

Mr. PASTORE. Where does the bill provide that the A.T. & T. can lend money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hold on just a moment. I will read it to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I invite the Senator from Louisiana to read section 201 to find the answer. Before the corporation can borrow a quarter, it has to go to the FCC and get permission to do so. That is written into the bill. The Senator from Rhode Island made certain that that requirement was placed in the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not think A.T. & T. would be hurt, based on the way the FCC has acted toward the proposed legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that; I simply ask the Senator from Louisiana to read section 201.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I prefer, first, to read section 304, subsection (3) (c), which supports the statement I have made:

The corporation is authorized to issue, in addition to the stock authorized by subsection (a) of this section, nonvoting securities, bonds, debentures, and other certificates of indebtedness as it may determine.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I continue:

Such nonvoting securities, bonds, debentures, or other certificates of indebtedness of the corporation as a communications common carrier may own shall be eligible for inclusion in the rate base of the carrier to the extent allowed by the Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. The last few words are important:

To the extent allowed by the Commission.

In other words, the Commission must act upon the proposal. I refer the Senator to section 201, with respect to the powers of the FCC.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee resent my speaking?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wished to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he would yield to me.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Louisiana has already yielded to me. Is there any objection to my speaking?

Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island read section 201.

Mr. PASTORE. I refer to subsection (8), on page 29. It is necessary to refer back to subsection (c) on page 27:

The Federal Communications Commission, in its administration of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and as supplemented by this Act, shall—

Now I refer to subparagraph (8), on page 29—

authorize the corporation to issue any shares of capital stock, except the initial issue of capital stock referred to in section 304(a), or to borrow any moneys, or to assume any obligation in respect of the securities of any other person, upon a finding that such issuance, borrowing, or assumption is compatible with the public interest, convenience, and necessity and is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with carrying out the purposes and objectives of this Act by the corporation.

That is the responsibility of a Federal agency. It must approve the borrowing of any money. The idea that there can be a conspiracy or that the A.T. & T. can lend money, whether it is wise to do so or not, in the hope that it will get a return of 6 percent—and I am quoting the Senator from Louisiana—is pure nonsense. The A.T. & T. or the corporation must go to the FCC and prove its case before it can receive permission to take such action.

If a lot of nincompoops who did not know what they were doing would serve there, that would be another story. But the Senator does not want this to be put under Government control. Instead, he favors control by a Government-owned corporation. And if there are now in the employ of the Government some nincompoops, then under the control the Senator proposes we might have nincompoops in charge as well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, I do not want to say whether anyone, either in the FCC or out of it, is a nincompoop. But the other day I stated—

Mr. PASTORE. And if the Senator asks me a question, I will give him the answer, because I have studied every part of this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the Senator from Rhode Island has a bill that will put the FCC in a position to decide how to protect the public interest.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And I say that we should see what the record of the FCC has been thus far. I say—and, by the way, this statement is in the hearings of the committee headed by the Senator—that the Federal Communications Commission in its entire history has never made a formal determination of what is a fair rate of return for interstate or international telephone service.

In fact, so far as I know, the FCC has never undertaken to hold a hearing in regard to what should be the charge for service from here to Europe.

Mr. PASTORE. We went all through that on Friday; and the Senator from Louisiana will remember that I pointed out that they stated that the rates are under constant surveillance. Furthermore, as a result of the activities of the FCC, the rates have been reduced 20 percent. However, I am not debating all that now.

This afternoon the Senator from Louisiana said that the A.T. & T. will run the corporation and will control everything—so much so that, so the Senator from Louisiana said, it will conspire to lend money to the corporation, and then have the corporation pay it back, but all for

the purpose of maliciously being able to make a 6-percent return. The Senator from Louisiana said that, just this afternoon. I said that is not true; and it is not true. Under the bill they cannot borrow a nickel or lend a nickel unless they get approval from the FCC.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Rhode Island begins by saying he does not know what kind of system will be authorized, but he says he knows what kind of corporation he wants set up.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But he does not know what kind of communication system he wants them to have.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right, and no living person knows that; and I am surprised that the Senator from Louisiana, who is not a scientist, would come here this afternoon and would say—when we are trying to find what is the best system, and through research and development—“Do not try to do anything in research until you find what the answer will be.” But how can anyone get the answer first? After all, which came first—the chicken or the egg?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the egg comes first if you use an incubator. [Laughter.]

Mr. PASTORE. But where does the egg come from?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the Senator from Rhode Island knows that the A.T. & T. has already built some big tracking antennas in Maine; I assume that the Senator from Rhode Island knows that. They are for the low-altitude system. Perhaps that is what will be used. In fact, if this bill is enacted, I suspect that they will proceed to use the low-altitude system. In fact, the testimony is that the Government expects to try for that first, anyway.

And when the low-altitude system is tried, I suspect that what they will find will be just about what the A.T. & T. now says will be found—namely, it will be found to be impractical, and that it would be many years before it could be made to work. So why would the A.T. & T. favor that? It could favor it because, as a result, over a period of years it would keep other companies out; and by the time they obtained one that would work—and it would work for about 10 percent of the cost of the other—most of the potential investors would have dropped out.

I began to make the point that the Senator from Rhode Island cannot tell me now—and I cannot tell him, and the FCC cannot tell any of us—what would be the correct charge for a telephone call from here to New Orleans or from here to Rhode Island. And the FCC cannot tell us that.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not, and it is impossible to tell that. In other words, if you call from Providence to New York, which is about the same as calling from New York to Washington, the cost is not exactly one-half, because you cannot measure it by miles. There is no basis by which what the Senator from Louisiana is suggesting can be done. We have gone through all of that.

But I wish to say that we are getting from the FCC the same dedication that

we would get if we followed the plan suggested in the Kefauver amendment, because the Senator from Tennessee wants to set up a publicly owned agency; and the minute that is done, it is necessary to call on the same kind of men that are called on when the FCC handles the work. If we are to rely on public servants, why does the Senator think one group would be wiser or more honorable than another group?

Last Friday, I said that anyone in the Government service who is incompetent should be fired.

But if we want proper supervision, what do we do? We trust and rely on the agency which has jurisdiction under the law; we rely on it to see that the public interest is protected. Our job is to see that the public agency in charge does its job. If it does not, its members should be fired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And I will offer an amendment to see that they do a proper job.

Mr. PASTORE. And if it is a good amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But when the Senator excuses the Federal Communications Commission for not doing its job, in 28 years, by not making a formal determination of the rate for either interstate or international service, he excuses the FCC—not on the basis the FCC says—but on the basis that this surveillance procedure will result in getting the job done. The FCC excuses itself by saying that it never has had sufficient staff and that Congress has not provided it with sufficient funds to enable it to do a proper job. In fact, I thought that was what the fight was all about a year ago, when the General Services Administration undertook to do the job; and it was able to get for the Government rate reductions amounting to about \$150 million, merely by contesting some of the long-distance rates the FCC was permitting to stand. I regret that a great many Senators failed to vote to permit the GSA to do that job.

Mr. PASTORE. Not only did I vote for that, but I also fought for it on this floor—in other words, to make sure that the public interest would be protected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hurrah for the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Just as the Senator from Louisiana also fought for protection of the public interest in connection with offshore oil. I voted that that oil belonged to all the people of the United States, not just to the people of a few of the States. In that case I voted to have the rates controlled for the benefit of all the people; and in this case, too, I am on the side of the people, no matter how much may be the glamour of the Senator's arguments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not attempting to criticize the intentions of the Senator. I am sure his intentions are good, and I am sure he is correct many times. I regret that he was wrong in connection with the two examples he gave; but I am sure that he will be right about many things, many times, and I salute him for voting to bring these rates under determination.

But let me read the rest of the record in connection with this matter—and it was not disputed:

Second. The Federal Communications Commission has never even determined the basis upon which such return should be computed.

Third. The FCC has never had a formal rate case on interstate or international telephone rates.

Fourth. The FCC has never been able to secure information necessary to set rates.

Fifth. The FCC has never known the costs to A.T. & T. of equipment sold to it by its subsidiary, the Western Electric Co., which produces almost all equipment used by A.T. & T.

And until they do, we shall never know what the rate ought to be.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but who said that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what the Celler committee said.

Mr. PASTORE. But the President never said that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The FCC itself said it, in the hearings before my subcommittee.

Mr. PASTORE. The FCC said what the Senator has said just now?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Who is testifying here—the staff member or the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the staff member told that to me, but the RECORD forbids the appearance of his name. The FCC, they said it to me, and I will provide the statement for the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned in connection with this matter, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Rhode Island did not want me to enter the colloquy—

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, yes, I did; but the Senator from Tennessee was trying to shut me off.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have never tried to shut off the Senator from Rhode Island. But since he has mentioned my name, I think I am entitled to be yielded to.

The Senator from Rhode Island said he thought the FCC would do as good a job as that which would be done by a corporation owned by the Government.

The FCC has done a very poor job for 28 years. It has never regulated A.T. & T. in its international rates. It has never had an all-out rate hearing on interstate rates. Notwithstanding the requirement that there be competition in the purchase of equipment, nobody else has ever had a chance to sell A.T. & T. any hardware; it has all been sold by Western Electric.

A.T. & T. has overcharged the Government, as the General Services Administration found. It overcharged the Government, through its subsidiary of Western Electric, \$67 million in the way of profits for work it got somebody else to do.

I do not think that is the kind of regulation which should be exercised over the vast communications satellite system which would be turned over to them.

As to other governmental activities, I think our research in NASA has been very good. I defy anyone to say that the development of atomic energy which was done by the Government, under Government contracts and Government direction, was not an outstanding job. I defy anyone to say that our Panama Canal work done by the Government was not done honestly or efficiently, or that the Tennessee Valley project, or other great Government projects, were not.

The difference is that in one case people are working to get a job done, without trying to see what they can get out of it. A.T. & T.'s motive has not been particularly to advance the cause of what the Government wants to do, but to see that its facilities and investment are protected. The FCC has been helpless to regulate it. After this record of 28 years of lack of protection of the public interest, I do not understand how anyone could feel that the situation would be different in the future.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may answer?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. First let me put in the RECORD a statement from page 482 of the hearing before the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Select Committee on Small Business on space satellite communications:

Mr. GORDON. Is it not so that A.T. & T. may require its operating companies to buy substantially all their equipment from Western Electric Co.?

Mr. Strassburg, who, as staff assistant for the FCC was testifying, along with his Chairman and ranking member at his side, said:

Well, there is some argument as to whether it is a requirement on the part of A.T. & T. imposed upon the operating companies of the Bell System. But the fact of the matter is that the Bell System companies do buy all of their equipment from Western or through Western.

Mr. GORDON. Is it not correct that Western Electric cost accounting methods are such that they do not provide an authentic basis for determining the reasonableness of the prices charged by the company?

Mr. STRASSBURG. I can only answer that by saying that we have not made a sufficient study of the matter to reach a judgment.

Senator LONG. Why not?

Mr. STRASSBURG. I suppose it is along the lines of the reasons I have given before from the standpoint of availability of manpower.

Mr. MINOW. I would add there, Mr. Chairman, what I mentioned earlier, that we have within the last week succeeded—Western Electric has acceded to a request that it lower its charges for telephone equipment to A.T. & T. in the amount of \$26 million a year. And we would be glad to make an exchange of those letters available for the record if you wish.

That is about the way reductions have been put into effect, so far as the FCC is concerned. Someone would say, "Call them in and see if they would be willing to reduce the rates." The company would have the decision of reducing the rates voluntarily or going to court; and they would do it voluntarily. One thing we can be sure of, Mr. President, and that is that when they reduce their rates

voluntarily, they are still too high. The FCC did not know what the rates ought to be, and did not have the facilities to ascertain what they should be. If anybody knew it, it would be the Bell System, but by voluntary agreements, they agree to reduce the rates by a certain amount. So far as appropriate interstate rates are concerned, that question has never been determined. The FCC has no basis on which to make such a determination.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Once we accept the concept that there should be a private corporation and in order to protect the public interest against the very problem raised by the Senator from Louisiana—and that is precisely what I have been trying to show and prove on the floor—we have gone out of our way, amending H.R. 11040. I know a few of my friends on the other side feel this should be a Government-owned operation, and I have the highest respect for their sincerity. I disagree with them in that regard. But admitting it to be a fact that we cannot have a public-owned corporation—and I do not think we are going to have one—I think we should adopt the suggestion of the President and create a private corporation. Once we have overcome that hurdle, I say to the Senator from Louisiana that we have gone out of our way in the committee, and particularly the Senator from Rhode Island, who attended all the meetings, as did the Senator from Texas, to protect the public interest.

For that reason, on page 27 of the bill is a provision precisely on the point raised by the Senator, in subsection (c) (1):

The Federal Communications Commission, in its administration of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and as supplemented by this Act, shall—

And this is the very first paragraph—

(1) insure effective competition, including the use of competitive bidding where appropriate, in the procurement by the corporation and communications common carriers of apparatus, equipment, and services required for the establishment and operation of the communications satellite system and satellite terminal stations—

Then we went a step further:

and the Commission shall consult with the Small Business Administration and solicit its recommendations on measures and procedures which will insure that small business concerns are given an equitable opportunity to share in the procurement program of the corporation for property and services, including but not limited to research, development, construction, maintenance, and repair.

We put that provision in the bill in our subcommittee in order to protect the public interest, to make sure that there would not be a monopoly, but that there would be competitive bidding in the purchase of the apparatus, not only for the ground stations constructed by the corporation, but even the satellites. How far could we have gone?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. PASTORE. I am not here this afternoon protecting Bell Telephone or A.T. & T. I have been fighting them all

my life. What I am doing is trying to protect the President's bill which was created to protect the public interest. Why? Because the President of the United States says we must do it now. The Senator is saying we can wait 2 years. The President of the United States says that is not so. Whose word do we take? The President's word, or the word of one or two Senators? Who has the responsibility to prove to the Nation and to the world that the job should be done now? The President of the United States. That is the reason why the Senator from Rhode Island is so much concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When one undertakes to say that the FCC is going to protect the public and see to it that the public gets the benefit of the lowest rates to which the public is entitled, and compatible with competition, he should recall I have already listed five failures of the FCC to do exactly what the FCC is under the obligation of doing. I now cite other failures of the FCC, which I made a matter of record on last Friday:

Sixth. The FCC has never determined the reasonableness of the service rates charged by A.T. & T. for carrying television programs both black and white, and color.

Seventh. The FCC has never determined the reasonableness of the entire telephone rate structure; that is, the internal relationship of rates.

Eighth. The FCC, even though its staff made definitive recommendations that action be taken toward a possible rate reduction, has not been willing to institute a formal rate investigation to determine whether the system's rates are unreasonably high.

Ninth. The FCC, for over 25 years, was not willing even to authorize the staff to negotiate on an informal basis with the Bell System in order to obtain a voluntary rate reduction.

Tenth. The FCC has never required A.T. & T. and its operating subsidiaries to buy telephone equipment or any equipment under competitive bidding—

Mr. PASTORE. That has all been changed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I close the quotation:

85 percent of the market has thus been closed to competition.

Mr. PASTORE. That has all been changed, under the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is talking about the space satellite part of the problem. If the Federal Communications Commission failed to do all of this, which was its duty to do, it is difficult for me to understand why anyone should expect a better performance in regard to new burdens than has been observed in regard to old burdens.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point? If the Senate should pass the Kefauver substitute amendment and permit the Government to own this operation, who would decide the fairness of the rates? Would it not be the Federal Communications Commission? Under the Kefauver substitute it is provided that the FCC will have to do exactly what we say the FCC will have to do. What difference would it make? You are criticizing the FCC, but the FCC is the re-

sponsible agency under the Kefauver substitute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator see my name on the Kefauver substitute amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. No; but the Senator says that this facility should be publicly owned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not said it should be publicly owned.

Mr. PASTORE. Everybody says that the FCC has to regulate the rates.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not said it should be publicly owned. I have said I would favor the maximum possible competition for the benefit of the people of this Nation. I believe that any proposed legislation which attempts to put this program in the hands of a private corporation should undertake to provide that it be organized in the best possible fashion to see that there would be competition between the new system and the existing international common carriers, of which A.T. & T. represents about 90 percent.

Congress so provided when it passed the legislation providing that water carriers could not be owned by rail carriers. The policy has been the same with regard to other surface carriers.

To me that seems to be about the best way to guarantee effective competition.

I have studied the problem at some length. I conducted hearings in regard to it myself. I have seen no need for this entire project to be turned over to a private corporation, before we know what kind of satellite system we are to put into orbit. I can see an urgency about developing it, and the Government is going ahead with a sense of urgency.

Mr. PASTORE. Before the Senator concludes, will he yield for another observation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We have tried to tighten up the provisions. I invite the Senator's attention to page 39 of the bill:

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 404. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive description of the activities and accomplishments during the preceding calendar year under the national program referred to in section 201(a)(1), together with an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of the attainment of the objectives of this Act and any recommendations for additional legislative or other action which the President may consider necessary or desirable for the attainment of such objectives.

We did not stop there. We provided further:

(b) The corporation shall transmit to the President and the Congress, annually and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments under this Act.

That is the Federal Communications Commission. We are getting after them, too.

(c) The Commission shall transmit to the Congress, annually and at such other times as it deems desirable, (1) a report of its activities and the actions on anticompetitive practices as they apply to the communications satellite programs; (ii) an

evaluation of such activities and actions taken by it within the scope of its authority with a view to recommending such additional legislation which the Commission may consider necessary in the public interest; and (iii) an evaluation of the capital structure of the corporation so as to assure the Congress that such structure is consistent with the most efficient and economical operation of the corporation.

We have done about everything it was humanly possible to do. We have done everything it was humanly possible to do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is some good language in the bill. I do not criticize that part.

I know the Senator is undertaking to see to it that the FCC will perform the job of regulating. I submit that the record shows that the FCC has failed miserably to regulate A.T. & T. It has never even been to court with this company.

As a matter of fact, the influence of A.T. & T. in the Government has been so complete and so impressive that it has usually been able to persuade the Congress to cut down on the money available to the FCC, to be sure that the FCC would not fully do its job.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make a correction, for the record. I am sure the record should show that the FCC as such never goes into court in regard to so-called telephone rates. The General Services Administration, which pays for the telephone charges within the Government, always appears in any rate case, representing the biggest customer of the company.

As a matter of fact, the GSA has appeared so frequently and so enthusiastically that there has been a lot of criticism with respect to the number of people the GSA employs in some of the cases they have gone into. There have been complaints by State agencies that the GSA has done too much of a job in these particular rate cases.

The FCC, as such, does not go into the cases. I think occasionally they are represented, along with the GSA, by counsel. They are not necessarily a party to any suit.

The General Services Administration has gone into court. The Senator from Washington is somewhat responsible for this. At one time, when the Interstate Commerce Commission allowed a general rate increase for transportation all over the United States to the railroads, no one had appeared in behalf of the Government, which was the biggest customer of the transportation system. In a hearing held by the Appropriations subcommittee which deals with the General Services Administration appropriation, I suggested that there be an enlargement of the shop which handles this problem. The money was provided.

The General Services Administration has been quite vigorous in its pursuit of these rate cases all over the United States, to the extent that in the past 2 or 3 years there has been debate on the floor of the Senate with respect to that part of the appropriation bill for the independent offices which deals with this

problem. There has been a long discussion as to whether the Federal Government has done too much, because the State regulatory commissions were complaining about this. There were motions made in the Committee on Appropriations to cut down the amount of money for the General Services Administration for this particular purpose.

That is the way it has been operating technically for the past 7 or 8 years, I believe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Government was saved \$145 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator, I am sure, remembers those debates.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] remembers them. I was trying to defend the amount. There was a great deal of criticism about the activities of the GSA in the rate cases, in representing the Government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Government was saved \$145 million. If the Government should not have been saved that money, certainly the court would have decided in favor of the telephone company.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana and I were on the same side of the issue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe we were. I was voting on the same side as the Senator from Washington. However, I fear that GSA's fine activity may have been discontinued or at least weakened.

That was, in the first instance, a job of the FCC, not a job of the GSA. The GSA got into that work because the FCC was not doing the job properly, as I have mentioned before.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So that the RECORD will be clear, the General Services Administration represents the Government in all rate cases, whether they involve telephone rates, transportation rates, power rates, gas rates, or electricity rates. The Government is a customer. The GSA comes in representing the Government as one of the customers, and protests a rate increase if it thinks it should be protested. It has been the main agency involved in such cases.

Some of the State agencies have said the GSA should stay out of the cases. We have had many long discussions of the problem in the Senate. Every time the appropriation bill dealing with the GSA comes before the Senate there is a discussion with respect to the legal department, which handles the work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Washington is quite correct. He has been very active in trying to see to it that the GSA has been provided sufficient funds to protect the Government from excessive charges by communications carriers.

Many millions of dollars have been saved the Government by the activities of the GSA. I have forgotten the amount saved the Government in connection

with the DEW line, but many millions of dollars were involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, many millions of dollars were involved in the DEW line case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has proved the point that some of us are trying to make. In spite of the fact that the communication carriers, particularly the A.T. & T., have overcharged the Government, the GSA was doing a good job in trying to save the interest of the Government and save the taxpayers' money. Yet there was activity on the part of the common carriers seeking to deny any appropriation for carrying on that work. That is the kind of situation we get into. When the agency attempted to cut down the profits that were being made, we discovered an attempt to cut out the appropriation. Actually the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations did deny the GSA any funds for that activity. Only upon the urging of the Senator from Washington and several other Senators who joined with him was the money put back into the appropriation.

In that connection I wish also to say that the A.T. & T. has been very active in trying to diminish and reduce the effectiveness of the GSA.

Through some influence they have been able to break up the local unit in the General Services Administration which has been so effective. In fairness, I wish to say that Mr. Boutin thinks that the way the thing is arranged now, they can still continue. But the extent of their activity and the type of activity they have been able to carry on as a unit has been very badly weakened. There has been a great deal of influence on the part of communication carriers in getting that done. I do not think that the record of the GSA shows that they do not want the Government to prevent them from making excess profits, which they were doing in connection with the DEW line and the other activities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to get the record straight or add to it. In the rate cases, the GSA has been designated to protect the Government as a customer in cases. When the GSA enters a rate case involving communications, electricity, or transportation, it does so on the ground that the Government is a customer and would be subject to unfair rates. They then help the general public in many cases in which the public would have no legal representative.

In effect, appearing for the Government has helped the public. If a rate increase was denied, the intervention has helped the customer, to wit, the Government.

But let us not confuse the SAGE case. That case involved a contract between the communications people and the Government. It involved a contract in the GSA. The Senator is correct. Through action in that case many millions of dollars were saved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The point I am trying to make is that the people who have been overcharging; namely, the communication carriers, have used their influence both in Congress and in the

agency to try to diminish the effectiveness of the regulator for one purpose. They have been taking money back from them for the benefit of the taxpayer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That question involved construction, operation, and many other things other than a straight rate proposition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The satellite project involves construction and many other things also.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I point out that the GSA has been active. As a customer, the Government has gone into rate cases in that way. I was somewhat responsible for increasing the appropriation some years ago when the Government had failed to appear in a rate case. It was the biggest customer and was most effective in that particular case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I appreciate the point that the Senator has made. The Senator has been active in seeking rate reductions.

The point I wish to make is that the FCC has the same public responsibility as a public service commission. I know that, as a public service commissioner, my dad used to institute proceedings to reduce rates. He would hold hearings and issue orders. If the parties did not like the decision, they could go to court about it.

That is the sort of function that the FCC has had. The GSA would not be active in that field if the Federal Communications Commission had done its job. The fact is that when the GSA undertook to do those things, it did them because the rate was clearly too high and it was so established.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss this subject at considerable length tomorrow. Therefore, I will conclude my speech for today.

LYLE WATTS, CHIEF OF THE FOREST SERVICE FROM 1943 TO 1952

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I regret to inform the Senate that on Friday last, Oregon and the Nation lost a great and dedicated man, Mr. Lyle Watts, Chief of the Forest Service from 1943 until his retirement in 1952, who passed away in a Portland hospital.

His career of dedicated service to the welfare of all the people in the conservation of our natural resources was exemplary. His contributions to the development of sound forestry practices will remain as a continuing memorial to his memory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the obituary material found in this morning's New York Times which summarizes his many valuable contributions.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYLE WATTS DIES; EX-FORESTRY AID—U.S. FOREST SERVICE CHIEF, 1943-52; ASSISTED UNITED NATIONS

PORTLAND, OREG., June 16.—Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service from 1943 until his retirement in 1952, died Friday of a heart ailment. He was 72 years old.

Mr. Watts began his career as a forest assistant in Wyoming in 1913. He was a member of the technical committee on forestry and primary forest products of the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture in 1944 and 1945. At several sessions from 1945 to 1951 he served as technical adviser to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's U.S. delegate.

Mr. Watts also took part in the United Nations Conference on Conservation and Utilization of Resources at Lake Success, Long Island in 1949.

Among the honors he received were the Department of Agriculture's Distinguished Service Medal and France's Croix de Chevalier de le Merite Agricole. He held honorary degrees from Utah State Agricultural and Iowa State Colleges.

After his retirement, Mr. Watts became active in the Oregon Democratic Party.

Survivors include his widow, Nell; a daughter, June; a son, Gordon, who is with the Forest Service in Washington; a sister, Mrs. Gladys O'Neill Bellingham, and a brother, Cecil.

SUPERVISED 150 FORESTS

As Chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Watts supervised the administration of more than 150 national forests covering about 180 million acres. He once advocated a six-point program to preserve the Nation's timber lands that included selective logging, reseedling, and intensive forest-fire protection.

Essential to his program was that "the American people must be conservation-conscious and aware of the importance of safeguarding our great natural resources."

He also said that insects and diseases were as damaging to the forests as fire but less was being done to cope with them.

A graduate of Iowa State College in 1913, Mr. Watts received a degree of master of forestry there 15 years later. He then left the Service for a year to organize and to become dean of the School of Forestry at Utah State Agricultural College.

Mr. Watts came out of retirement in 1954 to direct the conservation aspects of the late Richard L. Neuberger's successful Oregon campaign for the U.S. Senate. He later worked for Adlai Stevenson's presidential campaign in Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have lost not only a great conservationist dedicated to public service, but I have lost a personal friend. Mr. Lyle Watts advised me on many occasions in regard to conservation matters, and I have never found his advice wanting. I have always found that by following his advice, I have been well served on the issues about which he advised me. His advice was in the public interest of my State and in the whole field of natural resource and conservation development.

WORK OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Wednesday night of each week there is available to the public one of the most challenging news commentaries of our day. I refer to the presentation made by Howard K. Smith on the American Broadcasting Co.'s network. Last Wednesday, the evening of June 13, Mr. Smith sought an answer to the question "Is Congress Out of Date?"

Mr. President, the answer proved to be a bit rough on the Congress of the United States. It was highly critical; but, then, neither the House nor the Senate is without critics on either floor.

If the Congress merits criticism, such comment should be heard. If the criticism is undeserved, no harm will occur in the process. In fact, constructive criticism provides an invaluable margin of safety in our democracy.

Mr. Smith is not aware of many of the problems that face the Congress. For example, he draws public attention to the tremendous workload and the lack of staff personnel to tackle the tide of business that burdens Senators and Congressmen.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the transcript is worthy of the attention of the people and the Congress, for Mr. Smith believes there are serious weaknesses that we can correct. I request unanimous consent to have the transcript printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS CONGRESS OUT OF DATE?

(By Howard K. Smith, on "News and Comment," ABC Television, June 13, 1962)

Good evening. We call your attention tonight to the state of the U.S. Congress, sometimes called the keystone in the arch of American Government. Congress has been in session now for nearly 5 months, which is a respectable length of time. The pressures on it to stop work and go home are strong because this is an election year and five-sixths of the Members of Congress have to run for reelection. But, though in session for a long time and itching now to finish, Congress this year has passed not a single piece of major legislation so far. The President said the other day that he is contemplating listing bills according to urgent priority in order to get at least some of them considered before Congress does go home.

In the past, some sessions of Congress have been called "do nothing" or "do little" Congresses. One of the Members now, Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, labels this one the "goof off" Congress:

Mr. Gross. I would say that it is a "goof-off" Congress. It is the worst Congress, of course, do-nothing Congress, in my 14 years in Washington. We have such a thing as the T & T Club—the out-on-Thursday, back-on-Tuesday club—this is one of the reasons. There may be some hidden reasons that I know nothing about but it seems that for the benefit of certain people we must adjourn Congress on Thursday afternoon and either schedule noncontroversial legislation on Monday, or put the votes over until Tuesday, which gives them the opportunity to operate on the Thursday-to-Tuesday basis. This is to accommodate, I say, principally to accommodate Members on the Eastern Seaboard and contiguous areas who can get home in a short period of time—some of them to carry on business; some of them to carry on their political campaigning.

Mr. SMITH. Congress has always been more criticized than the other branches of Government. The famous British student of government, James Bryce, wrote in the last century, "Americans are specially fond of running down their Congressmen." Our pictorial commentators, the cartoonists, have always taken a cynical view of Congress that they do not hold toward other branches.

In 1889, Joseph Keppler, creator of the character "Uncle Sam," sketched this commentary suggesting that the real bosses of the Senate were the big moneyed trusts. In this century, Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, expressed the same thought about our system of checks and balances saying "the politicians get the checks, and the special interests have the balances."

Humor is heavily alloyed with cynicism in modern day cartoons of Senators like Dogpatch's celebrated envoy to Washington, Senator Jack S. Phogbound, in Al Capp's "Li'l Abner."

The same qualities of hypocrisy and opportunism show just below the surface humor in Senator Snort drawn for the Field Enterprises by George Lichty, and in round little Senator Caucus, drawn by Pete Wyma for the General Features Corp.

This rather low view of Congress has become so standard that there is a tendency to shrug off the implied criticisms as unavoidable and unimportant. In fact, I am going to argue tonight that it is very important and this reputation can be avoided. There have been periods when Congress was truly the keystone of our Government, well attuned to the people and creative in legislation. Just one example: In 1910 Congress became the inspiration and the leader of the Nation when the so-called "Insurgents" came to Washington determined to take up where Teddy Roosevelt left off:

Robert "Fighting Bob" La Follette, of Wisconsin, who beat the mighty railroads and the political bosses in his home State first.

Jonathan Dolliver, of Iowa, who said of President Taft, "He is an amiable man completely surrounded by men who know what they want," and proceeded to attack the influence of those men.

George Norris, of Nebraska, who broke the near dictatorial powers of Speaker Cannon of the House.

And William E. Borah, of Idaho, who authored or guided through the Senate some of the most needed legislation of the times.

By contrast it is hard to think of many really creative acts of legislation by Congress in recent years. It is hard to think of an occasion on which Congress stirred the hearts of Americans by word or by action as the executive branch often does, and the Supreme Court has done on at least two historic occasions in recent years.

I suggest to you that Congress' reputation today is not good and that, despite a number of exceptional individuals, it deserves its reputation. It is not attuned to the people. It is more and more negative and dilatory rather than creative and responsive. Its ethics are much lower than those of either branch of the Government.

An acute present-day writer on the Congress, George Galloway, has said "Representative government has broken down or disappeared in other countries. Here in the United States it remains on trial. Its survival may well depend upon its ability to cope quickly and adequately with the difficult problems of a dangerous world." Congress is not coping quickly or adequately.

Just before his death a decade ago, Senator Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska said, "Congress still labors under antiquated machinery and processes. The creaking machinery of Congress is so inadequate for modern times that free representative government itself is endangered."

Just one example to support that statement: To help it draft legislation, Congress has a staff of 28 lawyers and a budget of \$200,000. By contrast, a single one of the 10 executive departments—the Department of Agriculture—has 207 lawyers and a budget of \$2,400,000 to draft legislation. We could cite many many more examples of inadequate facilities causing Congress to lose its creative functions to the Executive.

For one other disability of Congress to fulfill its functions, it is hard to blame Congress. That is, complex modern times has multiplied the workload, especially of Senators.

An outstanding Senator, PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, announced recently he was

quitting politics because of the increasing workload:

Senator BUSH. It requires a great deal of simple old-fashioned homework and when my evening is free—that is, I don't have to go to a dinner here in Washington, or some meeting up in Connecticut—I take my briefcase home full of work and I'll spend 2 or 3 hours, frequently, trying to catch up on the reading and the reports of committees, the things that people send me to read that are appropriate to legislation that's pending here. If one didn't do anything else but tend to the homework that goes with his job and tend to the duties of his job as a Senator in Washington, he'd have a very good full-time job, I can assure you. So, that if you add the burdens of the call of the State to this, you'd see that the work of a Senator, for most States I would say, is very strenuous.

Mr. SMITH. HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, probably the most articulate of all Senators, tells of the growing duties of the Senate. He describes a typical Tuesday:

Senator HUMPHREY. The congressional leaders meet with the President every Tuesday morning for our legislative breakfast. This means that I arrive at the White House at around 8:30. Our breakfast starts at 8:45. We finish that breakfast anywhere from 9:30 to 10. Then, following that, of course, is the regular little press conference.

I then return to my office where I have committee meetings. The mornings are used for committee meetings in the Senate. Sometimes I find, and you try to solve this one, three committee meetings going on at the same time in three different buildings in three different parts of the Capitol, on three different subjects, and I am on all three committees. So, you have to be nimble of foot as well as of mind around here sometimes. But you select then, which committee you think is the more important, and you send a staff member, if you possibly can, to one of the others, or drop in on it. Then at noon, generally, one, two, or three luncheon groups, and I generally find little time to eat at noon. I frequently just call on the luncheon groups because many times they are constituents.

Then as the majority whip, I have to be on the Senate floor. So, I do a good deal of my office work right off the Senate floor in the whip's office off the Senate Gallery. I have many visitors that come in during the day that send in their card to the Senate and want to see me. I go out to see them.

During the afternoon, I will frequently have conferences with executive officers relating to problems of my constituents or problems on legislation. It is entirely probable that Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, will hold a, what we call, a policy meeting on the same day where the policy committee of the Democratic Party meets. And then later on in the afternoon, I attempt to answer telephone calls and, by the way, I average about 35, 40, 50 long-distance telephone calls every day. And I keep those slips in my pocket, if I haven't been able to answer them at my desk, and catch them as I go along.

I work late in my office on correspondence and have meetings at 5 to 7 o'clock—try to catch as many people as I can at that time. And then, sometimes during the day, there will be a dinner that we go to. I used to think that these dinners were fun, and I guess they can be, and sometimes they are, but really and truly, after a long day, you sometimes wonder if it might not be better if you just went home and didn't go to the dinner.

Mr. SMITH. Well, now, you are a member of three very important committees. Is it possible for a Senator to be an expert on as many things as he's expected to be an expert on? Can you master all of the subject matter?

Senator HUMPHREY. I cannot. And when I used to teach political science, we had an axiom or statement. We said, "Experts should be on tap and not on top." I'm not an expert. I hope to be a legislator and, in a sense, a policymaker, that is, to at least help shape and mold the policy of this country, as one Senator. But my activities are many in the Senate, and I must be interested in all of these activities.

Of course, you have special areas of interest. For example, I have taken a very keen interest in the field of international cooperation in medical research and scientific research. A keen interest in the problems of disarmament and arms control. But I serve and have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have to know about these agriculture problems. The State I represent is deeply involved in agriculture. Agricultural economics is the very life of our society in Minnesota.

I must be interested in the field of foreign policy. I am a chairman of a subcommittee and second ranking member on the full committee. And, of course, foreign policy is one of the most vital areas of our entire governmental activity.

I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. And that puts you across the board in everything. In fact, the Defense budget is one that we work with the Interior, Labor, Public Welfare, and Education.

I serve on the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which is an overall committee relating to the efficiency of the governmental structure, and I serve on a Senate Committee on Small Business. Now, any man that can be an expert in all of those fields is too good to be a U.S. Senator, or anything else I think, on this earth. So what I try to do is to have a good staff that works with me. We schedule our efforts as best we can to be well informed. I have specialists on my staff for each of these activities and others. And then I try to have a good working knowledge of these areas of endeavor. This takes time. I read all the time. When I come to work I read, when I go home I read, and when I travel on the airplane. I don't have a chance to read books any more, Mr. Smith. I just read pamphlets and documents and confidential, secret, restricted documents, until they run out of my ears.

Mr. SMITH. What about the increasing burden you have of nonlegislative activities?

Senator HUMPHREY. I spend at least 50 percent of my time on nonlegislative functions. And this is, I won't say it is a burden, it just takes a lot of time. The volume of mail. Well, it is just unbelievable. The mail pours in—I am not talking about pressure mail—I have had for example, on withholding, dividends and interest, this tax issue—I would say 15,000, 16,000, or more letters, and they all have to be answered and we work out policy statements and enclosures, but we answer every letter. Now, we have to use electric typewriters, robot typists. It is a big job just sorting the mail. I have a person in my office who spends all day long just opening mail—not answering it—just opening it, just sorting it. I run a sort of a junior postoffice. Our mail will average, at the end of a session, over a thousand letters a day. And, in the beginning it will run, 300, 400, 500 letters a day.

I have a dictaphone wherever I go, or one of those soundscissors whatever you call them. I have one in my home in Minnesota, in the hotel room when I travel. I have a portable that I carry with me. I have one at my home here in Chevy Chase. I have one in every office here in the Capitol, and I do not waste very many minutes of my time. I work on that correspondence.

And telephones. When I came here, we used to have two telephone lines and one private. We now have 10 lines and 2, so-called, private lines. And the only way you

can get into my office is through the private line. I have to have a line just to call in—there just is not any room on the board. Now, you figure that out for me, will you? I like it, do not misunderstand me. This is the kind of life I enjoy.

Mr. SMITH. That was Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the workload a Senator carries. The growing burden is a drag on Congress' achievement. But other factors are a greater drag.

In theory, Congress is representative of all America. But, in fact, it badly distorts the Nation's interests and needs.

The Senate was constructed to be distorted. With two senators from each State regardless of its population—there are eight mountain States containing only 3 percent of the American people—which have equal voting power in the Senate with the eight most populous States containing over 50 percent of the Nation's population. It is very hard for such a body to be interested in the problems of all the people.

The House, however, misrepresents the Nation rather more. The State legislatures, which draw up electoral districts where Representatives run for election, are dominated by rural interests. So, they draw up Congressional districts that will favor those interests. As a result the one-third of our Nation living in rural areas has a much stronger voice in the House than the two-thirds who live in urban areas.

But more serious than the under-representation of the Nation's majority in the House as a whole, is the gross distortion of power in control of the congressional committees.

The growing quantity and increasingly technical nature of legislation has caused committees of Congress to be more important than the whole House itself. In the year 1890, Speaker Thomas Reed said, "This House is no longer a deliberative body," and he was right. Bills are shaped and changed or made or killed in committee before they ever reach the floor of either House.

The chairmen of committees are chosen primarily by seniority. Legislators from one-party States or from conservative rural areas have greater security of tenure than those from populous two-party States. They accumulate seniority more easily and thereby win dominating positions on committees.

For example, there are 16 mighty committees in the Senate. The chairmen of nine of them, a majority of them, are Senators from Southern States of mainly rural interests, who are particularly out of tune with the times on rights. All the other Senate committees are headed by Senators from the Southwest and the West. Not one chairman comes from the populous States of the East, of the Middle West and of California. This, although the populations of two States—California and New York almost equal the total population of all the other States shaded on this map.

This cartoon, drawn for Fortune magazine by Ronald Searle, shows the committee situation in the House of Representatives. President Kennedy is shown at the throttle of the New Frontier express. Leading committee chairmen are at the switches able to halt legislation. The chief ones are Congressman WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, head of the mighty Ways and Means Committee, and Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, head of the still mightier Rules Committee. Of the nine key committeemen shown here, six are from the South. SMITH, of Virginia, MILLS, of Arkansas, PASSMAN, of Louisiana, MAHON, of Texas, VINSON, of Georgia, and HARRIS, of Arkansas. Only one, POWELL, of New York, is from a populous community.

The U.S. Congress is a captive body, a captive of interests attuned to the needs and concerns of neither a majority of our people

nor of our time in history. It is geared to be negative. A legislator who wants to achieve something positive has to run a whole gantlet of obstacles. A legislator who wants to prevent action has a wealth of opportunities.

President Eisenhower's Commission on Goals for Mid-Twentieth Century America said: "If Congress is to be an active partner in an active government, it must sooner or later move to reduce the power of its obstructionists." Congress has not done so. Obstruction rather than creation is now its characteristic.

There is one other serious blot on Congress. That is its ethics. Congress investigates everybody. But nobody investigates Congress. It is not permitted.

Nepotism—putting wives or relatives on the payroll—is common and open. One out of five Congressmen has a relative on the payroll, some at the top salary of \$16,000. Some of the relatives do not turn up at the offices where they are supposed to work.

Hasten reapportionment, so the House will be more representative of the majority of the people and no longer tied to a social makeup that no longer exists.

Have Federal grants to pay most election expenses, so that politicians won't be sensitive to special interests who are always at hand to offer campaign contributions for favors done.

It could foster the growth of the two-party system, so every politician will have to fight for his job, and seniority would not accumulate in one small section of the Nation.

You could make chairmanships of committees rotate. The list can still be according to seniority. But rotation would prevent any one man establishing a tyranny.

And, finally, a radical reform: Have one Chamber instead of two, and thereby eliminate the time-costing haggling between the two Houses. There would still be far more than enough means of delaying the legislation. The one Chamber's members could be more numerous so the committee load on each would not be so great. And the terms of their office should be 4 or 6 years so they won't be, as Congressmen now are, always running for office.

If Congress took strong action to improve itself, it would find a receptive public. For politicians' line of work can still capture the public imagination.

The U.S. Senate, for example, can still be very dramatic. One episode that has caught imaginations on a movie screen is the picture "Advise and Consent." In it, Peter Lawford and Charles Laughton as Senators clash in a movie version of a debate on the Senate floor:

Mr. Lawford: "Does the senior Senator from South Carolina think he knows more than the President about what or who is needed, in these perilous times, in the office of the Secretary of State?"

Mr. Laughton: "Yes, Senator. I dare say that even one so young and green as the junior Senator from Rhode Island would have chosen another man. Wouldn't you Senator, truthfully?"

Mr. Lawford: "The Senator assumes an entire ability of knowledge which denotes a closed mind, and an aged crust of prejudice." [Laughter.]

Mr. Laughton: "Really, Mr. President, we have here an example of the commotion this man Leffingwell can arouse. Able, sensitive, young Senators, taught courtesy at their mother's knees, turn upon their elders and offend them, because of their passions, over this disturbing man, Robert A. Leffingwell. I beseech, Senators, to contemplate the spectacle we are making of ourselves. Why? What is causing this bitterness of division in our party? Leffingwell. Who is disrupting the cordial flow of legislative interchange? Leffingwell. Who is turning this Senate into a cockpit of angry emotion? Leffingwell. I abominate this man Leffingwell. He is an

evil man. He will pursue a policy of appeasement. He will weaken the moral fiber of our great Nation. He will bring destruction to our traditions and I beg the Senators reject him. Reject him." [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH. Several times on this weekly report we have stressed the urgent need in our time for much better teachers, and for much better scientists. But for whatever may be said in derogation of them, the single most important necessity of the time is—good politicians. They have got to improve their institution. For as President Eisenhower said in an entirely different context—we need them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, early in this session Mr. Smith produced a most dramatic and challenging commentary upon our race with the Russians. Interestingly enough, he pointed out what I have many times stressed: Our greatest weapon for democracy is the type of quality education we provide our boys and girls. In his February 14, 1962 program, Mr. Smith pointed to the danger, that unless we as a Nation pay heed to this factor in our free society, we may not win the race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the script of Mr. Howard K. Smith's February 14, 1962, program be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS AND COMMENT

(By Howard K. Smith, Wednesday, Feb. 14, 1962, ABC Television)

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. My name is Howard K. Smith. And this is going to be an experiment in television journalism. In the golden age of radio—which was only a few years ago—the time around an hour on either side of supper time used to be a kind of an American forum of the air. You could choose among a dozen or more well-informed commentaries on the meaning of the events of the day to listen to. I believe that institution helped us make the quick transition we had to make from being an isolationist Nation indifferent to the outside world to being a responsible world leader learning to think about and act upon some very difficult problems.

This weekly report is going to be an attempt to put that kind of commentary on television. News commentary on television, as distinct from documentary reports, has been tried before. But nobody has ever succeeded at it yet. However, we feel that since then we have learned a little more about how to use television. ABC News wants to try. Our sponsor wants to try, and so do I. So here goes.

Each week we will deal with the events of the week as they happen, right up to the minute this program goes on the air. But today we would like to begin by laying a kind of foundation—state the basic problem of the time, and where our side stands. So our theme for the next half hour is going to be the familiar one—"The World Argument With the Communists." After 16 years nobody has yet found a better name for it than the "cold war". The paradox about it is—our side has everything it takes to win; but the other side over the long run has been gaining. Why?

We are going to use diagrams to establish the basic facts. Here is how the camps break down in absolute numbers of people available to each:

The Western Nations and all our allies have 1,005 million people.

The Communist bloc and all its satellites have 1,055 million people.

Tied to neither side, the neutrals of the world are about 1 billion even.

However, absolute numbers are not a good guide to strength or influence. What matters are the number of skilled, literate people able to organize, be organized, and to compete. And the neutrals have about 180 million of those.

The Communists have, on a generous estimate, about 500 millions.

The Western nations and allies have approximately 800 million skilled, literate, trained people.

Our side thus has far superior human resources.

Another basic measure of the strength and the competence of a group of nations is productive wealth—the gross national product of a nation's mills, mines and fields.

The annual Western output is \$900 billion in value.

The Soviet bloc's total annual output is approximately \$300 billion—or one-third of our side's.

The basic power potential is thus extremely overbalanced in our favor. But some people say the cold war is not a material contest; it is rather a contest of ideas. Our adversaries have the ideas that win people; and we have not. Well, that is not true.

For example, the Communists are free to broadcast anything they want to our side. But when we broadcast to their side, this sound rises to drown us out (jamming sound). They jam us with that noise, because they fear what we have to say.

Here is Edward R. Murrow, the man in charge of putting our ideas to the world, the head of the U.S. Information Agency:

Mr. MURROW. One thing I think ought to be remembered, Howard, and that is that the Communists have actually taken over in no country through the weight of their ideas or propaganda. They have done it through military force and no other way. It is worth remembering that even in Cuba, Castro never advanced orthodox Communist proposal or doctrine until after he came to power. He didn't mention Yankee imperialism and so forth until he had achieved power and I think in surveying how this great discussion, this savage competition between the United States and the Soviet Union is going, it is worth remembering that while they do have the appeal of simplicity, nevertheless their victories are not there on the grounds. Nothing is lost, not even in Africa. We in this country are too inclined to say, "Guinea is gone, Ghana is gone."

They aren't gone. There are going to be all kinds of new constellations, new confrontations, new leadership come up. This is going to be a long and as I say, a savage and unrelenting kind of competition.

Mr. SMITH. Is it true that your total budget for stating our cause everywhere in the world is approximately equal to what the Communists spend simply jamming our broadcasts in Europe?

Mr. MURROW. The Communists spend about \$125 million a year jamming our broadcasts. This is a calculable figure because one can tell how much it costs to build and operate a jamming transmitter. We have in dollars this year, this fiscal year, \$111.5 million. So they are spending more on jamming our shortwave broadcasts to the bloc countries alone than we have for our total effort.

Mr. SMITH. Well, doesn't that rather indicate that they think a great deal more of our argument than we think of it?

Mr. MURROW. It certainly indicates that they're willing to nourish their effort to a greater extent than we are. For example, we cannot prove this, but we are convinced that Castro is spending more money in Latin America than we are spending.

Mr. SMITH. Broadcasts?

Mr. MURROW. Yes. Broadcasting and in other forms of propaganda.

Mr. SMITH. Ed, I understand that the Federalist Papers, which are history to us, in fact are considered to deal with current questions in most of the new countries and that you have quite a market for copies of the Federalist Papers.

Mr. MURROW. Oh, we do indeed. We had in one small post of Africa more requests for the Federalist Papers in a matter of weeks than the New York Public Library had in the course of an entire year. I was recently in Nigeria, and there I saw in one of our centers, an evening adult education class in which they were studying the Federalist Papers and at great length because they face a problem, as you know, of federating just as we did at one time.

Mr. SMITH. That was Ed Murrow on the competition of ideas. Now we want to get right down to the core of what constitutes power—after this word from Nationwide Insurance.

The hard core of a nation's influence and power is its armed force. If your armed force is superior your diplomats tend to act with confidence. If it is weak they tend to behave timidly. In the 1930's, for example, German foreign minister Joachim von Ribbentrop was a poor diplomat, but he was successful because he was backed up by the strongest armed force then in existence. On the other hand, Eduard Benes of Czechoslovakia was a fine diplomat, but he was a failure because he had inferior force. The implied threat of armed force is mainly, in our still very imperfect world, what power and diplomacy are all about.

How do we stand in this respect? Once again we use diagrams:

Today the Western alliance of nations has a total of 8 million men in arms. That is the United States, Western Europe, Japan, and all other nations in Asia and Latin America allied to us.

The Soviet bloc—Russia and her satellites—China and her satellites, plus Cuba—has a total of 9 million men. That is, 1 million more than our side has.

The main place where the two sides confront one another is Europe. There our side has numerical superiority. Our side has 5.8 million men to their side's 5 million men available for use in Europe, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean.

But many of the West's men-in-arms are in navies, or else must be held in reserve lest trouble break out elsewhere. So for an actual trial of force on the ground in Europe—say over the Berlin question—we have approximately 1 million men available for actual combat.

The Communists too must subtract from their numbers. Many are untrustworthy satellite forces; many have to be held in reserve to police supply lines. So in fact we estimate they have about a million and a quarter men actually available for combat in Western Europe.

The Russians are somewhat superior in numbers. But they face a special danger. To fight us decisively in any ground conflict, they must concentrate their ground forces tightly and, if they do concentrate, they submit themselves to a terrible risk.

That is, small clean tactical nuclear weapons—you see one being loaded here. If we possessed only the big orthodox dirty atomic bombs we would be unwilling to use them in ground war in Europe. For they would spread fallout and radiation, and would wipe out our friends and satellite peoples and our own troops as well. However, we possess these clean nuclear explosives. They can be fired to wipe out a concentrated enemy battalion. But they will leave nearby villages and towns unharmed—no fallout, no radiation will affect them. Some experts believe that the Russians would never

concentrate in the face of this very great hazard.

That is relative strength in Europe. In the Far East we are far outnumbered on the ground by Red China. But the troops we have are of superior quality and mobility. Moreover, if we were being overwhelmed by an aggressive horde, experts say that we would probably resort to nuclear weapons as we did not in Korea and that would be militarily decisive.

There is great unwillingness to contemplate nuclear war. But unfortunately nuclear weapons exist in this time we were born into by accident. There is tension between the nations that possess them. So we have no choice but to think about them.

The consensus about nuclear power is that our side has nuclear superiority. But, superiority is not significant. Both we and the Russians have enough nuclear power to do dreadful damage to one another, no matter which side has more.

What does matter is—which side can better deliver the weapons to the opponent's soil? And the answer is, our side can deliver better.

The most spectacular means of delivery is missiles. We used to think the Russians had a big lead. In fact, latest information indicates we are just about even with one another.

But still the main means of delivering nuclear explosives is not missiles but bombers. We have about 1,700 bombers able to reach Russia from the United States. They have only about 200 able to reach us from the Iron Curtain.

In addition we have bases near them from which our short-range bombers can hit them. They have no such bases near us.

So, if the most terrible thing imaginable happened—a nuclear war—we could wreak much worse destruction on them than they could wreak on us.

There is much more to military power than this brief survey can show. For example, one nation can have a more brilliant strategy than the other; or it can have a higher morale. And strategy and morale can cancel out great numbers.

The best conclusion we can reach about defense is—there is probably a military standoff. Either side can do dreadful damage to the other * * * but only at the cost of having dreadful damage done to itself.

If this standoff prevails, the cold war will happily have to be settled in a different field of competition.

Now, in summary of what we have said up until now, our side has almost everything it takes to be superior. In military power we are at least equal and at best superior to our opponent. In almost all other realms that constitute competitive power we are well ahead. Yet the other side gives the impression of gaining. As Arthur Krock once calculated it, the Red bloc in recent years has been expanding its domain at the rate of about 45 square miles per day.

Why?

In part the Communist triumph is illusory. It has been created by their hyperthyroid propaganda and accepted all too readily by others.

They fill the papers with glowing statistics of their great economic progress. But, as President Kennedy said recently, the fact is that under the tsars in the year 1913, Russia produced 45 percent of what America then produced. Last year, after four decades of glowing statistics, Russia produced 47 percent of what we did. In nearly half a century they gained a mere 2 percent on us.

But even when that has been said, much of Soviet progress remains real. In recent years, their side has added to their domain Tibet, a bite of north India about the size of the State of Connecticut, Cuba, much of Laos, and some of Vietnam. They have made propaganda inroads in Africa and in

other places and their economic growth rate is at the moment a good deal higher than ours.

Why is it that we do not compete more effectively?

I think the answer is that we have been involved in heavyweight power politics for a very short time after a long national history of isolationism and indifference. We haven't had the time to learn the attitudes we much adhere to if we are going to prevail in this kind of power contest.

One of our wrong attitudes is the all-or-nothing attitude. That is, if the opponent will only declare all-out war on us, we will fight to the death. But if he challenges us in ways short of all-out war, we tend to do nothing. Russia has been very careful to analyze this and to put us before one challenge after another short of all-out war—subversion of people on our side; guerrilla warfare against people on our side; terrifying threats without war to people on our side. And all too often we have had no effective answers.

We need to develop a whole range of actions short of war to answer them or to harass them. For example, if they harass our traffic to Berlin, let us not go to war unless we are absolutely forced to. Let us instead harass and if necessary impound their ships in allied harbors. It will hurt them a great deal more than our stoppage in Berlin will hurt us, or if they push guerrilla war against South Vietnam on our side; let us—as we are now in fact beginning to prepare to do—help our friends to launch guerrilla war against North Vietnam on their side.

There can be a whole range of actions short of war that we can engage in and it will make them much more reasonable when they finally get to the conference table.

Another thing that suggests we have not yet grown up to the challenge is our tendency to break off into extremes.

On one side we have our pacifists with the slogan, that "War in the Nuclear Age is Unthinkable." If the President stands firm for our national interests they accuse him of irresponsible brinkmanship.

On the other extreme, the radical right wants to quit the U.N., break relations with Russia and virtually go to war which would isolate us from our allies and everybody else. If the President tries to negotiate with the Communists they consider him soft on communism.

The truth is, success in foreign policy consists mainly in finding the right mix of softness and readiness to conciliate on one hand * * * and toughness and refusal to yield on the other.

Another difficulty is simply our attitude toward the element of time. We make our budgets in our homes and in our businesses and in our Government each year. Our Congressmen run for reelection every 2 years. We tend to think in those short-run terms.

Since we seek results in the short run, we tend to exaggerate the damage to us of minor setbacks, like Cuba. We tend to be incapable of the long-range planning the Russians engage in, when they seek results over 5 or 10 or 20 years, instead of our 1 or 2 years.

But, for the most important serious self-imposed drawback that we have in the cold war is, I suggest, our reluctance to meet urgent nonmilitary national needs. Congress will appropriate anything for military hardware. But it is very hard to get action from Congress or the people, for example, on the one thing which may be decisive for the outcome of the cold war and that is education.

You know the trend in the education of scientists and technicians. In the year 1950, we graduated 52,000 of them and the Russians graduated only 36,000.

But 10 years later, in the year 1960, we graduated only 38,000, and the Russians

graduated 111,000. In an age of technological revolution this defect can be a serious one.

Now there are signs that the Russians are pulling ahead not only in technical education, but in all education.

In 20 or 30 years' time these will be the heirs to Nikita Khrushchev—Russian children in elementary schools today. If present trends continue they are likely to be much better educated to compete than the heirs to John F. Kennedy, who are now in our grammar schools.

This book, "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," is a comparative study of Russian and American elementary education. The author is Dr. Arthur Trace of John Carroll University. The main points that he makes in this book are: in regard to vocabulary an American third grader has a vocabulary of 1,000 words. A Russian third grader 8,000 words. Foreign languages—25 percent of Americans study a little of them and 100 percent of Russians study a lot of them. In regard to world history: A American ninth grader has had 1 year of it, a Russian ninth grader has 4 years. We would like you to meet Dr. Trace after this word from Nationwide Insurance.

Dr. TRACE. One of the most serious discrepancies, it seems to me, is in the difference in the vocabulary of the readers of the early grades. For example, a first grade Soviet reader has approximately 2,000 words as opposed to an American first grade reader which has approximately 300 and of course this rate increases tremendously in a Soviet reader. A third grade for example has about 8,000 words in a Soviet reader as opposed to approximately 1,000 words in the third grade American reader.

Mr. SMITH. That's 8,000 for a Russian kid and 1,000 for an American kid.

Dr. TRACE. That's right.

Mr. SMITH. In the same school level.

Dr. TRACE. That's right. I'm not going to say that all Soviet students master the 8,000 words but after all this, the demands that are made on Soviet children in reading are not excessively great. The European texts do the same. In other words, they're about right. It would appear that the level of instruction is to the dull child in our schools, not even the average child, the dull child.

Mr. SMITH. Well, now President Truman once said and Speaker Sam Rayburn told me before he died, American children today simply don't know enough American history. They can't understand today's problems when they don't know what led to today's problems.

Dr. TRACE. There is very good reason to believe that our children do not know nearly as much history as they ought to and I think one can explain why when one looks at the curriculum. Let me read to you a passage from the introduction to a 10th grade world history book to suggest the problem. "In writing a textbook for high school students that will cover the whole span of world history, it is necessary to present only the high points—the mountain peaks of men's experience, many of the hills and valleys and waterfalls are pretty uninteresting, and they are likely to clutter up the landscape and confuse rather than enlighten the student. We have therefore tried to exclude everything that does not shed light on our story." Well, you can imagine, then, that if a student happened to have a bad cold, he could miss out on Greek civilization and if he happened to contract pneumonia, he could miss out on the entire classical world even in this age of antibiotics.

Mr. SMITH. Well, now could you tell me specifically some things we might do.

Dr. TRACE. Well, I would suggest first of all in the basic reader that if children were taught to read at a rate at which they are capable and from readers which would

rather challenge their intelligence rather than insult it. I would suggest that this would be a major step in the right direction. And then students could go on and read. I believe that is the most crucial, the weakest of all the areas in our education program right now. It's the reading program in the elementary schools.

Mr. SMITH. Now how about curriculum. What would you do to curriculum?

Dr. TRACE. Well, the curriculum needs to be improved in the foreign languages and in history and in geography. The foreign languages, I might suggest for a moment, approximately only 25 percent of our students take a foreign language at all and those that do study it for only 2 years. That is 9 out of 10 of those who do study it for only 2 years. That's not enough to even get a student off the ground. In the Soviet Union, Russian students start in the fifth grade and if they continue on through their schools, through the new 11-year schools this would be a total of what—7 years of a single foreign language. The discrepancy is very great indeed.

Mr. SMITH. So where 25 percent of American children study a little of a foreign language, 100 percent of Russian children study a lot.

Dr. TRACE. As long as they are in school that's true and I might suggest, too, that perhaps 10 million Russians are studying English as against 50,000 Americans who are studying Russian and, of course, the Soviet students, are not studying English because they love America. They all want to be our commissars.

It is our conclusion that if we keep the risk of war too high for our opponents to dare and if our diplomacy is skillful and resourceful to prevent any conflict then the competition with the Soviet Union and with Red China will have to be settled in another more peaceful field. I believe that the central peril of the cold war is that in 20 years time the Russians may have a generation much better trained to cope with the modern world than we have.

This is a typical American first-grade reader. To read it a child needs to have a vocabulary of at most 300 words.

This is a standard first reader in the Soviet Union. To read it, a Russian child has to have a vocabulary of not 300 but of 2,000 words. I would suggest to you that this is where the space race will really be won.

This, not the atomic bomb or the intercontinental missile. This is the ultimate weapon in the cold war.

Good night.

OREGON'S SHARE IN AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Oregon's Share in Agricultural Exports," published in the Oregon Grange Bulletin on May 20, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S SHARE IN AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Sixty million acres of American cropland are producing for export. This is more than 18 times the harvested acreage of Oregon.

American agricultural exports are running at a record high rate of \$5 billion a year. U.S. farmers need these exports as an outlet for their efficient and abundant production, and as an important source of income. Foreign consumers need these exports as a significant source of food and clothing.

In fiscal year 1960-61 U.S. exports equaled half of the Nation's production of cotton, wheat, rice, and dried peas; two-fifths of the

output of soybeans and tallow; a third of the production of tobacco, hops, flaxseed, and nonfat dry milk; a fifth of the dried whole milk output; and a sixth of the feed grains sold off farms. Other important exports were fruits, poultry meat, and variety meats.

Farmers of Oregon have a direct stake in the exports of many of these agricultural commodities. In terms of the fiscal year 1960-61 national agricultural export total, the equivalent share of exports in this State was \$50.1 million for field crops excluding vegetables, fruits, and nuts; \$8.5 million for fruits and nuts; \$6.8 million for livestock and livestock products; and \$2.6 million for vegetables.

The export equivalent for specific commodities was \$32 million for wheat, \$1.4 million for pears, \$1.4 million for plums and prunes, \$198,000 for apples, and \$106,000—81 percent of National exports—for filberts and hazelnuts.

Export equivalents for livestock and livestock products were \$1.4 million for dairy products, \$900,000 for poultry and poultry products, and \$4.5 million for other livestock and livestock products.

Like all ports of America, Oregon also is an importer of agricultural products—but these are largely tropical or semitropical products not grown here, like coffee, tea, spices, bananas, rubber, etc. In addition, there are imports of competing products, often of special grade and higher price. Under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as amended, imports of the following commodities are limited: wheat and wheat products, cotton, cotton waste, cotton produced in any stage preceding spinning into yarn (picker lap), certain manufacturer dairy products, peanuts, tung nuts, and tung oil. As a whole, the equivalent share of agricultural exports from Oregon is over twice as large as the equivalent share of competing imports.

The domestic market is unable to absorb the total output of America's highly productive agriculture. Fortunately, there is active need for these products in foreign countries. In the more prosperous countries, incomes are rising and there is excellent opportunity to sell larger amounts of U.S. farm products provided such countries maintain liberal trade policies that permit U.S. agricultural commodities to enter and compete on equal terms with those of other suppliers. In the less prosperous countries, U.S. farm products obtained under programs such as Food for Peace are helping such countries in their economic development and at the same time increasing U.S. prospects for future commercial sales to them.

ASSESSMENT OF THE U.N.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Of Cats—And Bonds," published in the Oregon Grange Bulletin on May 20, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF CATS—AND BONDS

There is an old saying to the effect that there are more ways to kill a cat than by choking it to death with cream, which we think is particularly apropos to the question of solving the financial difficulties of the United Nations.

As we all know a very considerable number of member nations of the U.N. refused to pay their share of the assessment levied on all member nations to finance the police actions in the Congo and the Middle East. There is precious little the U.N. can do to

bludgeon the recalcitrant countries into paying their assessments, but a majority of the U.N. did vote for a bond issue to finance the activities of the U.N.

The bonds will become the general obligation of the U.N. and will be paid from the general fund to which all nations must pay their dues or forfeit their vote in the assembly.

We are glad the Senate has passed (by a vote of 70 to 22) the bill authorizing the President of the United States to buy up the \$100 million worth of these bonds—and we hope the House of Representatives takes similar action at an early date.

WHEN YOU PLANT A TREE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, brief remarks entitled "When You Plant a Tree" were delivered at the ninth annual Willamette Tree Planting Festival in Oakridge, Oreg., by Mr. H. R. Glascock, Jr. Mr. Glascock is forest counsel to the Western Forestry and Conservation Association. I ask unanimous consent that his observations on planting of a tree appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN YOU PLANT A TREE

(By H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

When you plant a tree today, you make an investment in tomorrow. You join hands and become a partner with Nature in renewing a perishable but dynamic resource—a crop with expanding usefulness to man. From seeds, so tiny there are 36,000 in a pound, to tall timber trees there is a growth struggle you play a part in winning, when you plant a tree.

When you set a seedling in the ground, you take a hand in shortening the cycle from forest seed to harvest. You become a practical conservationist by doing what others only talk about; by helping to assure accessible resources for future generations.

And you take on responsibility for placing this seedling in soil where it is free to grow, and so that it can best withstand the numerous enemies of young tree growth. Frost-heaving, drought, mice, rabbits, deer, aggressive grass or brush may fell your little tree before it is far along. So set it well, when you set out a seedling tree. And plan to return to check on its establishment. If a tree dies, plant another in its place.

WHEN YOU PLANT A TREE

You plant jobs when you plant trees. Jobs for future citizens of this great State, for your sons and mine. You plant revenue to run local government and for schools and roads. You also plant an ever-wider spectrum of forest products for service to mankind. And you take a part in that continuing rotation of forest cover which favors wildlife and watersheds. Did you know that you do all of these things when you plant a tree?

When you plant a tree, Nature plants a thousand more. For Nature is the master planter of all. Bountiful and prolific as she is, however, she works in her own good time and ways. A partnership in which Man understands and works with Nature, such as you have here, is most productive of human benefits and inspirational beauty. Man is learning how to work with Nature and sustain himself—when he plants a tree.

"He that planteth a tree is servant of God,
He provideth a kindness for many generations;
And fables that he hath not seen shall bless him."

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON THE SENATE SIDE OF THE CAPITOL AND IN THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall say only a word on this subject, because I must go to a conference in the majority leader's office. I shall discuss the subject at greater length before the week is over. However, so that no one will think that I have forgotten about it, I wish to raise again the question of serving liquor in the public rooms in the Senate section of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings, and I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Journal entitled "No Cocktails in the Capitol."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO COCKTAILS IN THE CAPITOL

One does not have to be a prohibitionist to regret that the Senate Rules Committee has pigeonholed Senator WAYNE MORSE's resolution to ban drinking in the public rooms of the U.S. Capitol.

The Capitol is as much a shrine as the Lincoln Memorial. It is dedicated to the serious conduct of the Nation's business, and it houses statues and paintings of the Nation's heroes. Tens of thousands of persons visit it every year, most of them with reverence and a feeling of awe, and among those visitors a very large proportion are children.

A babbling cocktail party in such a setting cannot help but detract from the dignity of its surroundings.

Note that the proposal was to prevent drinking in those rooms of the Capitol which are open to the public. In that amazing marble warren there are many private hide-aways where Congressmen, if they feel the need, can ease the bruises of legislative battle with the judicious application of bourbon and branch water. Some persons object to that long-standing practice also, but even they would probably agree that it is less objectionable than drinking in public.

Like the little boy in Lewis Carroll's poem, Senator MORSE is open to the charge that he does some things only "to annoy, because he knows it teases." The members of the Rules Committee apparently felt that this was such an instance. We wish they had taken him more seriously this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I am awaiting a reply from the Committee on Rules and Administration to a kindly and courteous and proper letter which I sent to the committee some time ago, asking the members of the Rules Committee whether the report which I inserted in the RECORD was correct. That report stated that my resolution had been indefinitely postponed.

If that is true, and if the committee does not see fit to make it possible for me to present to the committee the testimony of responsible leaders of various organizations, I shall start at an early date to conduct my own committee hearings on the floor of the Senate, day by day, and week by week, if necessary, so that all these witnesses may have an opportunity, at least through my lips, to testify as to their position on this question, including one church leader after another. If Senators think the Senate

is going to adjourn without this issue being made a matter of full record, so far as responsible people in our country who protest the action of the Senate is concerned, they are very much mistaken.

I care not how long the Senate needs to stay in session in order that I make this record. The right to petition the Government for redress is a very precious constitutional right in this country. What the senior Senator from Oregon is asking the Committee on Rules and Administration to do is to extend the right to people to petition the Rules Committee through a hearing, to present their opposition to a policy which was officially established by the Senate when the new conference room was opened with a considerable amount of fanfare on April 2 of this year.

This is one matter that the Senate is not going to sweep under the rug so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned. I intend to make a record on the issue. The large number of people—and they are increasing week by week—who are concerned have a right to be heard on the subject. The Senate has the duty to give them a hearing, in case the Rules Committee does not wish to reverse the action that it initiated when it not only proceeded officially to provide for the serving of hard liquor at official Senate functions in its public rooms, but apparently also, so I understand, authorized Senators to get permission to use this conference room and other rooms for affairs of their own sponsorship, at which, in effect, these rooms, for the period that they are used, are turned into bars.

Those of us who do not share the point of view of such Senate public policy have a duty to our constituents to make the record. I propose to make that record.

I would much prefer to have this question handled by means of an official hearing of the Rules Committee, preceded, if possible, by a meeting of the Rules Committee in executive session, if it wants such a meeting with the senior Senator from Oregon. So far as I am concerned, this is a matter of procedural policy in regard to which the American people are entitled to have full public disclosure made. We are not going to do that if we deny a great number of our people the right to be heard—people who have the privilege and the right to be heard in protest of a policy of the Senate that they consider to be entirely unjustifiable.

THE PEOPLE PETITION FOR KING-ANDERSON BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have recently received a petition bearing about 150 signatures from the area of Beaumont in Jefferson County, Tex., expressing strong support of the King-Anderson bill and urging that it be enacted into law.

I ask unanimous consent that the following statement and all the signatures thereto be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 5, 1962.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, who are residents of Beaumont, and area, Jefferson County, Tex., are strongly in favor of the proposed King-Anderson medical care bill and respectfully urge you, as our representative in the U.S. Senate, to do all in your power to enact the said King-Anderson bill into law.

J. G. Moore, Sr., Pete Sala, Andy Hebert, T. S. Hughes, C. S. Barker, B. L. Green, Johnnie Tatam, J. E. Bowen, Joan Williams, L. L. Bynum, Claude McIntyre, Beaumont, Tex.; Lewis W. Spake, Port Neches, Tex.; Mr. J. G. Moore, Mrs. P. E. LeClaire, Beaumont, Tex.; John C. Shaw, Silsbee, Tex.

J. L. Mott, E. N. Lucas, James Gardiner, Bobby Burton, Steve Cordova, Herman Davis, Daniel Tuquette, W. O. Bostick, A. L. LeBlanc, William V. Harrington, Geo. W. Doitt, Mrs. Louise King, William H. Thornton, S. C. Renfro, Jr., Harold L. Jones, Val Blackburn, Duese Fontenat, Bevis Wilson, Robert J. Becks, Pat L. Killebreu, Geo. J. Corrigan, Robert F. Petlock, S. A. Ferlitta, J. W. De Ramus, Chas. A. Ferlitta, Charlene Ferlitta.

H. J. Marsiglia, Joe Lozarro, H. J. Ozio, George Powell, Mrs. George Powell, Wallace Jarrell, Helen Jarrell, James Segum, Adam Victor, F. E. Riley, Mrs. F. E. Riley, Beaumont, Tex.; Mrs. E. C. Coody, J. I. P. Gaines, El Paso, Tex.; D. D. Adair, Mrs. G. W. Dorton, Beaumont, Tex.; A. G. Jewett, Jr., Port Neches, Tex.; Mrs. Joseph Beinlaqua, Jr., Ralph C. Lawson, M. F. Lawson, Shannon Wilson, Mrs. Shannon Wilson, Beaumont, Tex.

S. W. Humphrey, Pearl O. Humphrey, Betty Sue Burton, David Lee Humphrey, Olin G. Kirby, Mrs. Olin G. Kirby, J. B. Irving, M. J. Hebert, Earl Barrileux, R. C. Spain, Mrs. G. L. Spain, Mrs. Mozella Marie Williams, Mr. Robert Williams, Mrs. Irene Josephine Pirt, Roy Kirby Pirt, Mr. Leon Showers, Mary Lydia Gardiner, Equilla Robinson, Mary Pauline Robinson, Lillian Ann Gardiner, Dianna Marie Goodman, Raymond David Goodman, Edward Gardiner, Mrs. Altha Mae Jackson, Mr. Clarence McKinkley, Mrs. Victoria Lee Gardiner, Beaumont, Tex.

Mr. Rodney J. Gardiner, Beaumont, Tex.; Sidney C. Reed, Louis Reed, Armond Reed, Mrs. Alice Green, Mr. Roy Green, Mrs. Rose Fobe, Houston, Tex.; Mr. Harold Stewart, Linda Fay Gardiner, Dianna Marie Goodman, Loretha Gardiner, Arthur Cluff, Joseph Daugas, Anthony Gardiner, Alfred Wilson, Idma Mae Bordors, Juanita Lane, Billie Earl Bordors, Johnnie Mae Berrie, Johnnie Ray Berrie, Frances House, Bill Gardiner, Mary Hooper, Bissie Mae Dinnis, Cryell Dinnis, Beaumont, Tex.

Debria Glenda Dennis, Raymond Goodman, Larenza A. Lockett, Betty Little, Viola Lockett, Lele Gardiner, Erall Stanley Gardiner, Mildred Delores Goodman, Gary Gordon, John Gordon, Ruby Mae Bassett, Charlotte K. Payne, Jessie Belton, Jr., Darrell James Bassett, Rebecca Marie Jackson, Roberta Jackson, David Allen Robinson, Derbra Annette Robinson, Edward Montgomery, Robert Bowers, and Oralitha Johnson, Beaumont, Tex.; Mary Alice Green, David Lee Labuld, Houston, Tex.; Joe Johnson, and Audry Bowser, Beaumont, Tex.

Irma Montgomery, Alice Greene, Shirley Robinson, Ionna Faye Bowser, Dudley Robinson, Jr., James Bowser, Fannie Cutten, Dwight Bowser, John Montgomery, Joseph Bowser, Irene Robinson, Dudley Robinson, Beaumont, Tex.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 18, 1962:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Samuel Scolnic, Congregation Beth-El, Bethesda, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we have turned our attention to the vast reaches of outer space, but we know all too well the harrowing problems that continue to plague us here on earth. The mysteries of Thy universe beckon to us, but the hard realities of this planet will not leave us.

If one crisis follows another, it is because our earth has become a tiny, shrunken, little planet. Neither the depths of the seas nor the heights of the mountains separate men from men, or nation from nation. Millions of human beings live, as it were, in one neighborhood, even on a single block. And from out of the dim past comes Thine inspired word "v-ahavta l'reacha kamo-cha"—"thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Cause us, O Lord, to know that love and teach us that we may apply it to all men wherever they may be, for the checkered history of man proves beyond all question that hatred only breeds more hatred and war only breeds more war. Only through love can these vicious cycles ever be broken—through our love of Thee, the love of our neighbor, the love of our fellow man.

In the words we render in the synagogue each Sabbath Day we invoke Thy blessing " * * * upon our country, on the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority. Do Thou instruct them out of Thy law, that they may administer all affairs of state in justice and equity, that peace and security, happiness and prosperity, right and freedom, may forever abide among us and among all the inhabitants of this earth." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 15, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4083. An act to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products;

H.R. 4939. An act to provide for the conveyance of all rights, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Jasper County, Ga., to the Jasper County Board of Education;

H.R. 5456. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof;

H.R. 7866. An act to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to extend the application thereof to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 8434. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Mount Shasta, Calif.;

H.R. 9736. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit certain property to be used for State forestry work, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10374. An act to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives;

H.R. 10986. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;

H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8141. An act to revise the laws relating to depository libraries.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 678. An act to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands;

S. 2139. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American War Mothers, Inc.;

S. 2436. An act to transfer certain land in the District of Columbia to the Secretary of the Interior for administration as a part of the National Capital parks system, and for other purposes;

S. 2977. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 3063. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

S. 3064. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

S. 3315. An act to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia;